United Nations A/CN.10/PV.310

General Assembly

Official Records

Disarmament Commission

310th meeting

Monday, 4 April 2011, 10 a.m.

New York

Chair: Mr. Al Bayati ..... (Iraq)

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

Opening of the session

The Chair: I declare open the 2011 substantive session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission.

Before we take up the first item of the day, on behalf of all the members of the Commission, allow me to extend my sincere gratitude to Mr. Shaaban Shaaban, Under-Secretary-General of the Department for General Assembly and Conference Management, which is responsible for servicing the Disarmament Commission, as well as to Mr. Sergio Duarte, High Representative for Disarmament Affairs and head of the Office for Disarmament Affairs, which will provide substantive support to the Commission's session.

The presence of Mr. Duarte, a widely respected diplomat, once again underlines the importance of the Disarmament Commission, in general, and Member States' high expectations of this session, in particular. It gives me special pleasure to give the floor to Mr. Sergio Duarte.

Mr. Duarte (High Representative for Disarmament Affairs): I am honoured to address the Disarmament Commission as it opens its 2011 substantive session. I wish to commend its departing Chairman, Ambassador Jean-Francis Régis Zinsou, for his competent stewardship of the work of the Commission last year, as well as to recognize with appreciation the many efforts of the Bureau last year. I also wish to congratulate Ambassador Hamid Al Bayati on his recent election as the new Chair. The Office for Disarmament Affairs stands ready to assist you, Sir, the members of the Bureau and all delegations during this session.

The Commission is commencing its substantive work today in an international environment that is evolving before our eyes. Many developments open possibilities for new progress in addressing the challenges posed by weapons of mass destruction and conventional arms that the world community has long faced. Yet many other developments raise concerns that multilateral efforts to meet those challenges will give way to other alternatives. At best, those could include limited gestures by like-minded States to plant the seeds of future multilateral norms. At worst, they could lead to the desperate pursuit of security through armed self-help.

The institutions of the United Nations disarmament machinery, including the Disarmament Commission as its deliberative body, are intended to be useful to Member States in achieving their common goals. Yet the ultimate responsibility for the fate of disarmament initiatives lies at the doorsteps of Member States, whose policies, priorities and sheer persistence will shape the contours of our world to come, for better or for worse. Those, in turn, will be influenced by the actions and expectations of civil society, the mass of humanity recognized in the Preamble of the Charter as the peoples of the United Nations.

This session is especially important given that the Commission is now approaching the end of its three-

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

11-28782 (E)

Please recycle

year cycle. Despite the frustrations of the past, hopes still remain for achieving consensus on each agenda item, namely, "Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons", "Elements of a draft declaration of the 2010s as the fourth disarmament decade" and "Practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons".

We are all aware that the Commission has not been able to reach consensus on substantive issues for over a decade. Such difficulties, together with those shared by other parts of the disarmament machinery, led to the High-level Meeting on Revitalizing the Work of the Conference on Disarmament and Taking Forward Multilateral Disarmament Negotiations on 24 September 2010. In his capacity as Chairperson of that Meeting, next year the Secretary-General will submit his report and observations to the first session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2015 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. It is my hope and, I am sure, the hope of many delegations here today, that the report will be able to state that this year the Disarmament Commission reached consensus on the important issues on its agenda. The fate of that report and the work of the Commission remain, of course, in members' hands alone.

In conclusion, I would like to underscore the relevance of the Commission's current agenda to the long-standing goals of the United Nations with regard to weapons of mass destruction and conventional arms. While disarmament and the regulation of armaments are mentioned in the Charter, the United Nations has had to adapt to changing circumstances, which it has accomplished through various administrative reforms, the adoption of General Assembly resolutions, the negotiation of treaties in the Conference on Disarmament and the adoption of principles, guidelines and recommendations by the Disarmament Commission. Each of the issues on the Commission's agenda today constitutes part of a larger ambition — that of general and complete disarmament under effective international control, which has remained the United Nations ultimate objective in this entire field since the first special session of the General Assembly on disarmament.

It is an impressive reaffirmation of the wisdom of the United Nations Charter that even in 1945, before the first test of a nuclear weapon, the world understood the need to pursue simultaneously disarmament and arms control goals. The Commission's agenda reflects that understanding. I therefore hope that this will inspire new efforts to achieve consensus in the weeks ahead. Together, we have a solemn legacy to maintain and a new future to create for generations to come.

The Chair: I thank Mr. Duarte for his statement. At this stage, I would like to offer some remarks from the Chair's perspective.

As we grapple with the crisis of the present and confront future challenges, we should recognize that all our work during this session, as well as during previous sessions in this cycle, is an important part of the efforts to advance global disarmament and arms control norms and, thereby to strengthen international peace and security. I hope that the growing recognition throughout the world of the magnitude of disarmament and non-proliferation stakes, which has inspired calls for action in the recent past, will be conducive to a positive outcome of this year's substantive session of the Disarmament Commission, the last in the current cycle.

Unfortunately, the Commission's efforts to make progress have so far been unsuccessful. Indeed, obstacles and difficulties are inherent in trying to reach agreement through consensus. In the end, finding solutions to overcome such difficulties should be possible, considering the widespread agreement that exists on the importance of the issues before the Commission. I am confident that efforts will continue to be made towards that end. We should not allow such obstacles to undermine our collective efforts to find solutions that are acceptable to all parties.

If there is no consensus on the items on the agenda, the outcome of this session will only add to the Commission's unsatisfactory record of recent years. That should be avoided. Certainly, the Disarmament Commission does not function in a vacuum. Progress towards any consensus on recommendations by the Commission is dependent upon the space created for such progress by developments in the broader field of disarmament, non-proliferation and arms control. That is particularly true of our efforts regarding the adoption of a declaration of the 2010s as the fourth disarmament decade. We face a real opportunity to take stock of progress in the field of disarmament and to forge a vision for the next decade that transcends any specific issue or challenge.

I am confident that the members of the Commission will provide their contributions to fruitful discussions on the substantive issues at hand. I believe that there is potential to move forward in this disarmament forum and to reap the benefits of commonly agreed guidelines and norms. There is an urgent need to demonstrate the political will needed to restore the credibility of the disarmament machinery.

As the Commission knows, the former dictatorial regime of Saddam Hussein in Iraq had an extensive programme for acquiring, manufacturing and developing all kinds of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), including nuclear weapons. Saddam wasted billions of dollars of the Iraqi people's wealth on such programmes. After Saddam's invasion of Kuwait, in 1990, the United Nations imposed sanctions on Iraq and forced the regime to dismantle those weapons programmes. Billions of dollars more were spent on dismantling those weapons.

Since the fall of Saddam's dictatorship, in 2003, the new Iraqi Government has pursued a policy of openness towards the international community, respecting the principles of international humanitarian law and implementing its international obligations, including those imposed because of the hostile policies of the former regime towards neighbouring countries. The new Iraqi Constitution states, in article 9, that Iraq will fulfil its international obligations regarding the non-proliferation, non-development and non-use of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, and that it will prohibit related equipment, materials, technologies and delivery systems for use in the development, manufacture and use of such weapons.

The new Iraq is different from the Iraq that existed before 2003. The United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission, which was tasked with verifying Iraq's compliance, was terminated by Security Council resolution 1762 (2007). Iraq has signed and joined many international conventions and treaties in the field of disarmament, such as the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction; the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty; the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Production, Transfer and Development of Cluster Munitions; the Additional Protocols to the Comprehensive Safeguards Agreement of the International Atomic Energy Agency; The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation; and the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material. Following our cooperation in these fields, Iraq was elected a member of the Executive Board of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons for the period 2010-2012.

Organization of work

The Chair: Members of the Commission may recall that the Commission formally adopted its agenda (A/CN.10/L.65) at its organizational session on 28 March 2011. Therefore, the Commission is not going to take any action at this meeting other than to simply take note of document A/CN.10/L.65. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Commission agrees to take note of that document.

It was so decided.

Election of other officers

The Chair: We shall now proceed to the election of the remaining members of the Bureau. As members will recall, the Commission has still to elect the Rapporteur and six Vice-Chairs, namely, one from the Group of African States, one from the Group of Asian States, two from the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States and two from the Group of Western European and other States.

I should like to inform the Commission that the Group of Asian States has nominated Mrs. Byrganym Aitimova of Kazakhstan for the post of Vice-Chair of the Commission.

I now give the floor to the representative of Liechtenstein.

Mr. Stamm (Liechtenstein): In my capacity as Chair of the Group of Western European and other States for the month of April, I would like to announce the candidatures for the position of Vice-Chair of Mr. Jean-Cédric Janssens de Bisthoven of Belgium and Mr. Francisco Javier Sanabria of Spain.

The Chair: I have been informed that consultations in the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States are still ongoing. We will take up the election of Vice-Chairs from that Group at a later stage.

I should like to inform the Commission that the Group of African States has nominated the

representative of Senegal as candidate for the post of Vice-Chair of the Commission, the representative of Nigeria as candidate for the post of Vice-Chair for the Working Group to discuss elements of the draft declaration and the representative of Benin as candidate for the post of Rapporteur of the Commission.

I shall now read out the names submitted thus far for Bureau positions. For the post of Vice-Chair, I have been informed of the candidacies of Mrs. Byrganym Aitimova of Kazakhstan, Mr. Jean-Cédric Janssens de Bisthoven of Belgium, Mr. Saliou Niang Dieng of Senegal and Mr. Francisco Javier Sanabria of Spain. Nigeria is to chair Working Group II, while Benin is to serve as Rapporteur. The names of those representatives will be communicated at a later date.

Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Commission agrees to elect those members of the Bureau.

It was so decided.

The Chair: I congratulate the members of the Bureau who were just elected to the positions of Vice-Chair and Rapporteur. I look forward to working with them to achieve the objectives of the Disarmament Commission.

As members are aware, there are three substantive items on the Commission's agenda for this last year of the current cycle, namely, "Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons"; "Elements of a draft declaration of the 2010s as the fourth disarmament decade"; and "Practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons".

At our organizational session on 28 March, in addition to the two existing Working Groups, we established a third Working Group to deal with practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons. The only pressing issue at this point is the election of the Chairs of those three Groups. I have been informed that the regional groups are continuing their consultations regarding nominations of the Chairs of the two remaining Working Groups. I would appeal to them to complete that process as expeditiously as possible, in order to start meetings of the Groups as planned, on Wednesday, 6 April. I wish to remind delegations that the third Group will start its work after the first and second Groups have finished theirs.

I would now like to draw the Commission's attention to the revised programme of work prepared by the Secretariat, which is contained in document A/CN.10/2011/CRP.1. As members may recall, some delegations proposed changes to the document at our organizational meeting. The current document reflects those changes. As members will note, we have allocated seven meetings for each Working Group on an equitable basis. Also, Working Groups I and II will hold their meetings during the first half of this session, to be followed by the meetings of Working Group III.

Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Commission wishes to take note of the programme of work contained in document A/CN.10/2011/CRP.1.

It was so decided.

General debate

The Chair: As we begin the general debate, I would like to urge delegations that have not yet done so to inscribe their names on the list of speakers as soon as possible, as we plan to conclude the general debate tomorrow at 6 p.m. I would also like to remind delegations that we will follow the established format for the length of statements, namely, 15 minutes for delegations speaking on behalf of groups and 10 minutes for delegations making statements in their national capacity.

Mr. Kőrösi (Hungary): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU). The candidate countries of Croatia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Montenegro, the countries of the Stabilisation and Association Process and potential candidates of Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as Ukraine and the Republic of Moldova, align themselves with this statement.

First, allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as Chair of the 2011 session of the Disarmament Commission, as well as all the members of the Bureau. The EU looks forward to working closely with you to achieve a successful outcome to this session.

The EU recognizes the importance of the Commission as the specialized, deliberative body within the United Nations multilateral disarmament machinery allowing for in-depth deliberations on

specific disarmament issues. The EU welcomes the work carried out last year by both Working Groups. We look forward to working closely with you, Mr. Chair, and with the Chairs of the Working Groups, to consider practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons before concluding the current three-year cycle.

The EU welcomes the renewed momentum in global disarmament and non-proliferation, as illustrated by, among other things, the successful 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the entry into force of the New START agreement, as well as important events in the field of conventional arms, such as the entry into force of the Convention on Cluster Munitions. We reaffirm our commitment to treaty-based arms control and disarmament and underline the need to renew multilateral efforts and to strengthen and reactivate multilateral instruments. In that context, we aim to make the best possible use of the Commission.

Reinforcing the non-proliferation regime should be a key priority for all States in order to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. The proliferation of such materials to non-State actors is one of the greatest threats to our common security. The EU therefore is an active supporter of the vigorous implementation of Security Council resolutions 1540 (2004) and 1887 (2009). The EU is currently working on a new decision to provide financial assistance to facilitate this work.

For the EU, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) remains the cornerstone of the global nuclear non-proliferation regime, the foundation for the pursuit of nuclear disarmament and an important element in the responsible development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The EU therefore welcomes the adoption by consensus of the Final Document (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol. I)) of the 2010 NPT Review Conference, and is highly committed to the implementation of all the action plans related to the Treaty's three pillars.

The EU is also committed to the full implementation of the understandings reached at the NPT Review Conference concerning the 1995 resolution on the Middle East and the establishment of a zone free of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery in that region. As for the seminar in support of the process leading to a zone in the Middle East free of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery to be organized in 2011, the European Union is actively engaged in its preparation and calls upon all States in the region to participate in it in the most constructive spirit.

Universal adherence to, and the rigorous implementation of, all NPT obligations are key to international security. The Treaty's regime is particularly challenged by the nuclear proliferation in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the risk of nuclear proliferation in the Islamic Republic of Iran. The EU deplores that Iran continues to fail to address serious concerns about the nature of its nuclear programme. Iran's refusal to fully cooperate with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and to implement the Additional Protocol, contrary to the relevant resolutions of the IAEA Board of Governors and the Security Council, precludes the resolution of outstanding issues, in particular those pointing to a possible military dimension. The IAEA therefore remains unable to conclude that all nuclear material in Iran is for peaceful activities and remains concerned about possible undisclosed activities, which might also be related to the development of a nuclear payload for a missile. The EU reiterates its commitment to seeking a comprehensive, long-term solution to the Iranian nuclear issue through dialogue and negotiations in accordance with Security Council 1929 (2010). The EU High Representative has continued her efforts to engage Iran in a phased approach of confidence-building but, so far, Iran has not shown readiness to take up this opportunity.

The EU highlights the indispensable role of the IAEA in verifying States' compliance with their nuclear non-proliferation obligations. The EU reiterates its call for the universal conclusion of comprehensive safeguards agreements and additional protocols, which together form today's verification standard. The EU also stresses the key role of the Agency in ensuring the responsible development of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, in the best safety, security and non-proliferation conditions, by countries wishing to develop their capacities in this field. In this context, the European Union supports the further development and implementation of multilateral approaches to the nuclear fuel cycle.

The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) is of crucial importance to nuclear

disarmament and non-proliferation. The renewed political commitments to pursue ratifications of the CTBT, in particular by annex 2 States, and recent progress in the build-up of its verification regime give new impetus to our efforts to achieve the earliest possible entry into force of this key Treaty. Pending the entry into force of the Treaty, we urge all States to abide by the moratorium and to refrain from any actions that are contrary to the obligations and provisions of the CTBT.

With regard to the Conference on Disarmament, the EU attaches great importance to the immediate commencement of negotiations on a treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, including verification provisions, on the basis of the mandate contained in document CD/1299. Pending the entry into force of such a treaty, we call upon all States concerned to declare and uphold an immediate moratorium on the production of such material. The adoption of the 2009 programme of work, contained in document CD/1864, demonstrated that the start of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty is within reach.

During its first special session devoted to disarmament, the General Assembly attached great importance to the participation of all States possessing nuclear weapons in the negotiating body that is now the Conference on Disarmament. The EU welcomed the High-level Meeting held in September 2010 aimed at the revitalization of the Conference on Disarmament. The EU stands ready to contribute to further efforts to ensure effective follow-up to the Meeting.

In this three-year cycle, the EU has underlined that the Commission should devote adequate attention to conventional weapons, including the full implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. The EU is strongly committed to improving international and regional responses to the harmful and destabilizing effects of unregulated transfers of conventional weapons and their diversion to the illicit market. Thorough legislation in the area of transfers of conventional weapons is already in place in the EU, and is being implemented by all EU member States.

The EU strongly supports the concept of an international arms trade treaty and is actively participating in and promoting the process leading towards its realization. The EU welcomes the positive results of the sessions of the Preparatory Committee held in New York in July 2010 and February and March 2011 ahead of the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty, which is to meet in 2012 to elaborate a legally binding instrument on the highest possible common international standards for the transfer of conventional arms.

In addressing the challenges of the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons, the European Union remains committed to working with all Member States within the framework of the 2001 Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. The EU continues to consider this international instrument as the main multilateral framework to respond to challenges posed by the illicit trade in, and excessive accumulation of, small arms and light weapons.

In the run-up to the 2012 Programme of Action Review Conference, we look forward to participating in the discussions of the forthcoming open-ended meeting of governmental experts in May 2011. The EU believes that that meeting could be an opportunity to apply a pragmatic and results-driven approach to enhancing the implementation of the Programme of Action. In that regard, the marking and tracing of small arms and light weapons seems to be a pertinent and substantial issue to discuss.

We are also convinced that the time is ripe for a more strategic assessment of the efforts that the international community has made to address the risks posed by the illicit trade and excessive accumulation of small arms and light weapons. The 2012 Review Conference should provide the occasion for Member States to assess thoroughly the level of implementation of the Programme of Action, 11 years after its adoption, to consider its adequacy to respond to threats related to small arms and light weapons and to take the right decisions to further improve the Programme of Action and speed up its implementation.

In the view of the European Union, international cooperation continues to be a key element in ensuring the full implementation of relevant international, regional, subregional and national instruments aimed at preventing the illicit trade in, and excessive accumulation of, small arms and light weapons. Guided

by its 2005 small arms and light weapons strategy, the European Union continues to support third countries' efforts to tackle trafficking in small arms and light weapons. We assist third countries and regional organizations in their implementation of the Programme of Action and other relevant instruments, such as the International Instrument on Marking and Tracing and the United Nations Firearms Protocol. We also continue to work on the elaboration of innovative tools and practices to prevent the illicit trade of small arms and light weapons, in particular via air.

In our view, transparency in military matters, including international arms transfers and military spending, continues to be a major confidence-building measure that deserves further attention. The EU reiterates its strong support for the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and the United Nations System for the Standardized Reporting of Military Expenditures. We encourage all Member States to contribute to the success of both instruments by regularly submitting their national reports. We are equally convinced that, in order to remain relevant, the Register of Conventional Arms should also include an additional category devoted to small arms and light weapons.

The European Union welcomes the substantial progress achieved in the universalization and implementation of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction. The financial and political support provided by the European Union and its member States to mine action has been substantial. Our support has focused on the promotion of the universalization of the Convention and assistance to States parties in complying with their obligations, including stockpile destruction, clearing mined areas, risk education and assisting victims. The EU is committed to implementing the Cartagena Action Plan and is working on a specific draft decision in support of it.

The EU remains firmly committed to responding to the humanitarian problems caused by cluster munitions. The EU considers it essential to make strong commitments in this area that are likely to lead to concrete results on the ground vis-à-vis the victims of such weapons, and thus to have a true humanitarian impact.

Furthermore, the EU welcomes the adoption of the Vientiane Plan of Action 2010-2015 at the First Meeting of the States Parties to the Convention on Cluster Munitions, which took place in the Lao People's Democratic Republic in November 2010.

The European Union remains firmly committed to preserving and developing the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW), which constitutes an essential part of international humanitarian law. We look forward to the Fourth Review Conference in Geneva in November 2011. A successful Review Conference will review, clarify and strengthen the existing obligations and their implementation. In our view, it should make progress on, or bring to a conclusion, the issues currently under discussion. It should also set perspectives for useful future work.

In conclusion, Mr. Chair, we wish you every success in your endeavours and assure you of the complete support of European Union member States in this process.

Mr. Errázuriz (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the members of the Rio Group. At the outset, the Rio Group wishes to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as Chair of the 2011 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission, as well as the other members of the Bureau. We would also like to express our gratitude to the 2010 Chairs of Working Groups I and II, namely, Mr. Paolo Cuculi of Italy and Mr. Johann Paschalis of South Africa, for their efforts to conclude their work. In the same vein, we wish the Chairs of Working Groups I, II and III every success at this session. We also welcome the participation of the High Representative for Disarmaments Affairs, Mr. Sergio Duarte, and thank him for his opening remarks.

The Rio Group reiterates its willingness to work constructively towards completing the complex tasks entrusted to the Commission. We hope that during the current session, the third and last of the three-year cycle for two of the substantive items, progress can be made that will make it possible to adopt specific recommendations.

The Rio Group reaffirms the role of the Disarmament Commission as the specialized, deliberative body within the United Nations multilateral disarmament machinery that allows for in-depth deliberations on specific disarmament issues,

which lead in turn to the submission of specific recommendations to the General Assembly.

Regarding the item entitled "Recommendations for achieving the goal of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons", the Group reiterates its firm position in favour of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation in all their aspects, as well as its concern about the serious threat to humanity posed by the very existence of nuclear weapons and the slow progress towards their total elimination, which is the only absolute guarantee against the threat or use of such weapons.

The Rio Group, while welcoming a number of positive signals regarding nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, emphasizes the need for urgent and consistent actions aimed at the total elimination and legally binding prohibition of nuclear weapons within a specified time frame.

The Rio Group welcomes the holding of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, held in New York in May 2010, and takes note of the fact that it adopted a substantive Final Document (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol. I)). The Rio Group notes that, though imperfect, the Document represents an outcome that can be built upon and further enhanced in the future. In our view, the agreed plan for follow-on actions makes a positive contribution to the goal of disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation, serving as a basis for constructive engagement in seeking concrete results towards the goal of a world free from nuclear weapons.

The Rio Group reaffirms both the importance of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) — the cornerstone of the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime — and the balance among its three pillars. We are fully committed to its universality and therefore urge States that have not yet done so to accede to the Treaty as non-nuclear-weapon States. We also call on States parties to the NPT to fully comply with all their obligations and to fulfil their commitments under the Treaty. We reaffirm the importance of not interpreting or implementing the Treaty on a selective basis.

The Rio Group urges the nuclear-weapon States to fulfil fully their nuclear disarmament obligations under article VI of the Treaty and to comply with their commitments thereunder, in particular the practical steps towards nuclear disarmament agreed to at the 2000 NPT Review Conference and the action plan adopted at the Eighth Review Conference. We call on the nuclear-weapon States to expedite measures to that end.

The Rio Group reaffirms the inalienable right of developing countries to participate in the research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination. We also reaffirm that all parties to the Treaty should undertake to facilitate, and have the right to participate in, the fullest possible exchange of equipment, materials and scientific and technological information for the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

The Rio Group also emphasizes the importance of nuclear-weapon States irreversibly, transparently and verifiably reducing their nuclear arsenals with a view to their complete elimination within a specified time frame.

The Rio Group views the entry into force of the Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms as an important step in reducing their deployed nuclear arsenals. We look forward to its early implementation. Although the Treaty represents significant progress, the Group calls for additional substantial reductions, in particular with respect to non-deployed and non-strategic nuclear weapons. Furthermore, the Group calls on all nuclear-weapon States to take concrete, transparent, verifiable and irreversible steps to eliminate all types of nuclear weapons, which still number in the tens of thousands.

The members of the Rio Group belong to the region that established the first densely populated nuclear-weapon-free zone, under the Treaty of Tlatelolco of 1967. As States parties to the Treaty, we urge nuclear-weapon States to withdraw the interpretive statements made on accession to the Protocols of the Treaty. Similarly, the Rio Group renews its commitment to the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in other parts of the world, and expresses its satisfaction that the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference supports the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in areas of the world where they do not yet exist, in particular the Middle East.

The Rio Group welcomes the convening of the Second Conference of States Parties and Signatories of Treaties that Establish Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones and Mongolia, held at Headquarters on 30 April 2010. We recognize the contribution of that initiative to the strengthening of the disarmament and non-proliferation regime.

The Rio Group reaffirms the role of the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral negotiating body on disarmament. The Rio Group deeply regrets that, despite the positive developments in 2009 and the efforts made in 2010 and 2011, the Conference on Disarmament has not been able to adopt a programme of work. The Rio Group urges all members of the Conference to demonstrate the political will necessary to ensure the start, without delay, of its substantive work through the adoption and implementation of a balanced and comprehensive programme of work that moves the nuclear disarmament agenda forward, including negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention, a universal, unconditional and legally binding instrument on negative security assurances for non-nuclear-weapon States, the prevention of an arms race in outer space and a multilateral and non-discriminatory treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

The Rio Group reiterates its position with regard to the complete cessation of all types of nuclear testing. We underscore the importance of all States maintaining a moratorium on all types of testing of nuclear weapons and all kinds of nuclear explosive devices. The Group stresses the importance of the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. In that connection, we welcome the declarations of some States listed in annex 2, in which they state their intention to take steps towards its ratification. We hope that they will soon become concrete actions. The Rio Group calls on all annex 2 States that have not yet done so to ratify the Treaty as a priority issue, as proof of their political will and commitment to peace and international security.

With regard to the item "Elements of a draft declaration of the 2010s as the fourth disarmament decade", the Group believes that the fourth decade will have a positive role in mobilizing global efforts to respond to current and emerging challenges in the areas of disarmament, arms control, proliferation and international security. The Group also underscores the importance of moving the international disarmament agenda forward, and believes that now is the time to work constructively on a road map leading to the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

With regard to the third agenda item, entitled "Practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons", the Rio Group believes that such measures are an important instrument for international peace and security, as they complement efforts in the areas of disarmament and non-proliferation. Our region has taken significant steps towards the implementation of confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons. Such measures help to strengthen international peace and security because they are specifically intended to promote understanding, transparency and cooperation among States. We therefore believe it necessary to strengthen, improve and extend confidence-building measure at all levels. In that regard, it is worth recalling the relevant General Assembly resolutions, including resolution 63/57, which was adopted by consensus.

One objective of such resolutions is to strengthen the exchange of information on confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons. In that respect, the information voluntarily provided by States is electronically recorded in a database on the website of the Office for Disarmament Affairs, and, in accordance with resolution 65/53, is available in the six languages of the United Nations.

The Rio Group stresses the important work being carried out by the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean, as well as the assistance that it provides to the countries of the region for the implementation of disarmament measures in various areas.

In conclusion, the Rio Group reaffirms its readiness to cooperate with you, Mr. Chair, and the members of the Bureau for the achievement of concrete results during this session. We call on all delegations to show the necessary will so as to achieve a good outcome leading to practical steps towards the common goal of a safer world.

Mr. Kleib (Indonesia): I am honoured to speak on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM).

Let me first congratulate you, Sir, on your election as Chair of this year's session of the Disarmament Commission. I also congratulate the members of the Bureau on their election and the Chairs of the working groups on their assumption of their posts. The Movement is confident that, under your able leadership, there will be tangible advancement on the globally agreed agenda on disarmament and non-proliferation. We assure you, Sir, the members of the Bureau and the Chairs of the Working Groups of our full support. We look forward to working with all Member States.

We would like to also express our appreciation to His Excellency Mr. Jean-Francis Régis Zinsou of Benin, 2010 Chair of the Commission, and the previous Chairs of the Working Groups for their hard work. NAM welcomes the remarks by the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs. We very much appreciate his efforts in facilitating the realization of the Commission's aims.

Before I proceed, NAM would like to express its deep commiseration with the Government and people of Japan over the recent tragic double event of the earthquake and the tsunami. As the nation of Japan heals from those disasters, our sincere and heartfelt wishes remain with the victims of the disasters and the people of Japan.

While noting some positive international developments in the context of nuclear disarmament, NAM underscores that much more remains to be achieved to attain a world free of nuclear weapons. We stress our concern over the slow pace of progress towards nuclear disarmament, and emphasize the importance of accelerating progress towards the objective of nuclear disarmament.

The Movement reiterates its concern at the threat to humanity posed by the continued existence of nuclear weapons and by their possible use or threat of use. We urge States, particularly the nuclear-weapon States, to fulfil completely their pledges and obligations on nuclear disarmament in a transparent, irreversible and internationally verifiable manner, and on nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects.

NAM emphasizes its principled positions on nuclear disarmament, which remain its highest priority, and on the related issue of nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects, and stresses the importance of that fact that efforts aimed at nuclear non-proliferation should be parallel to simultaneous efforts aimed at nuclear disarmament, both processes being mutually reinforcing, and the fact that all States should fulfil their respective obligations. The ultimate aim in the disarmament process is general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control in order to strengthen international peace and security.

NAM recalls that at the Sharm el-Sheikh summit held in July 2009, the NAM Heads of State and Government reaffirmed the Movement's longstanding position regarding the absolute validity of multilateral diplomacy in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation. In that regard, the Group reaffirms the relevance and centrality of the Disarmament Commission as the sole specialized and deliberative body within the United Nations multilateral disarmament machinery, providing for an in-depth deliberation on specific disarmament issues, with the submission of concrete recommendations before the General Assembly. The Group also recalls the paramount importance and continued validity of the consensus outcome of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

The work of the Commission has made contributions in the field of disarmament and arms control, as reflected in its numerous productive sessions, including when it was able to reach consensus on guidelines for establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones and for conventional arms control. The Disarmament Commission can be highly effective, especially in the field of nuclear disarmament, and we hope that work in that regard will be intensified with reinvigorated political will.

The Movement hopes that the agreed goals on nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects will be fulfilled at the earliest. In this context, we see the deliberative function of the Commission becoming more important, given the need to make rapid advances towards the achievement of disarmament goals.

NAM underlines the importance of the Conference on Disarmament as the only multilateral negotiating body on disarmament and reissues its call on the Conference to agree on a balanced and comprehensive programme of work by, inter alia, establishing an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament at the earliest and as the highest priority.

The Movement stresses the necessity to start negotiations in the Conference on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified framework of time, including a nuclear weapons convention. To that end, and to help prohibit the development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use or threat of use and to provide for the destruction of all nuclear weapons, the NAM once again calls for an international conference at the earliest possible date.

We note that despite NAM's best efforts during the 2010 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission, substantive progress could not be attained in Working Group I on recommendations for achieving the objective on nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, we note the constructive discussions held in the Working Group and expect that at this session the Commission will agree on concrete recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in all its aspects.

We reaffirm the importance of the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and to bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control.

NAM reiterates that the total elimination of nuclear weapons is the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Pending the total elimination of nuclear weapons, vigorous efforts should be made as a matter of priority for the conclusion of a universal, unconditional and legally binding instrument on security assurances to all non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

NAM reaffirms the importance of the application of the principles of transparency, irreversibility and verifiability by nuclear-weapon States in all measures related to the fulfilment of their nuclear disarmament obligations. While noting the conclusions of the New START treaty, the NAM stresses that reductions in deployments and in operational status cannot substitute for irreversible cuts in and the total elimination of nuclear weapons.

NAM reaffirms the inalienable right of developing countries to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, without discrimination. The NAM continues to note with concern that undue restrictions persist on exports to developing countries of material, equipment and technology for peaceful purposes.

The NAM States that are parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) emphasize once again that nothing in the Treaty shall be interpreted as affecting the inalienable right of all parties to the Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination and in conformity with articles I, II, III and IV of the Treaty. We stress that this right constitutes one of the fundamental objectives of the Treaty. In this connection, we confirm that each country's choices and decision in the field of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy should be respected without jeopardizing its policies or international cooperation agreements and arrangements for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and its fuel-cycle policies.

NAM stresses that all States need to pursue in good faith intensified multilateral negotiations, as agreed by consensus in the Final Document of the Tenth Special Session of the General Assembly, to achieve general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.

NAM stresses the significance of achieving universal adherence to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), including by all nuclear-weapon States, which, inter alia, should contribute to the process of nuclear disarmament. The continued commitment of all State signatories, especially the nuclear-weapon States, to nuclear disarmament is essential if the objectives of the CTBT are to be fully realized.

In this context, NAM had submitted a concrete proposal to Working Group I of the Commission. The Movement hopes that its proposal will be duly taken into consideration, and, to that end, we are ready to engage in a constructive discussion.

The Movement notes that Working Group II, which is dealing with elements for a draft declaration for the fourth disarmament decade, did not manage to conclude its work during the 2010 session, although it had constructive substantive discussions. In order to arrive at the convergence of positions that is necessary for the Working Group to reach consensus

recommendations on the elements for a draft declaration for the fourth disarmament decade, the NAM urges all delegations to display the necessary political will and flexibility during the 2011 session of the Disarmament Commission. The Movement hopes for a comprehensive, balanced, concise, forward-looking and principle-based outcome to the Working Group's efforts at this session, and we pledge our full cooperation to that end.

NAM reaffirms its longstanding position on the urgent need to convene the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We are deeply concerned at the fact that that session has yet to be convened despite the efforts we have made for many years in this regard. NAM welcomes the overwhelming support of the General Assembly, which, in its resolution 65/66 of 8 December 2010, decided to convene an Open-ended Working Group. It is our aim that this Working Group be convened in accordance with the aforementioned resolution and that it should hold its organizational session at the earliest for the purpose of setting a date for its substantive sessions in 2011 and 2012, and submit a report on its work, including substantive recommendations, before the end of the sixty-seventh session of the General Assembly.

All members of the Commission should fulfil their disarmament obligations and prevent nuclear proliferation in all its aspects. In the effort to attain nuclear disarmament, international and regional approaches, and confidence-building measures complement one another. Wherever possible, these should be pursued simultaneously so as to promote regional and international peace and security. In this context, NAM stresses that nuclear disarmament, as the highest priority established by SSOD-I and as a multilateral legal obligation, should not be made conditional on confidence-building measures or other disarmament efforts.

The Movement also believes that the most effective way of preventing terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction is through the total elimination of these weapons. We further underline that the threat posed by terrorists' acquiring weapons of mass destruction should be addressed within the framework of the United Nations and through international cooperation, consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and international law.

The Movement remains deeply concerned by the strategic defence doctrines of the nuclear-weapon States, including the NATO Alliance Strategic Concept, which not only sets out rationales for the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, but also maintains unjustifiable concepts of international security based on promoting and developing military alliances and nuclear deterrence policies. NAM stresses the importance of the reaffirmation by the nuclear-weapon States of their legal obligations and of their refraining from sharing nuclear weapons with other States under any kind of security arrangements, including in the framework of military alliances.

During the organizational session of the Disarmament Commission, NAM supported the establishment of Working Group III to deal with the agenda item on practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons, and hopes that progress will be made on this agenda item. In this regard, NAM reaffirms the sovereign rights of States to acquire, manufacture, export, import and retain conventional arms for their self-defence and security needs. We express our concern about unilateral coercive measures, and emphasize that no undue restriction should be placed on the transfer of such arms.

NAM recognizes the significant imbalance in the production and possession of and trade in conventional weapons between the industrialized and NAM countries, and calls for a significant reduction in the production and possession of and trade in conventional weapons by the industrialized States with a view to enhancing international and regional peace and security.

The NAM States parties to the NPT are concerned about the lack of concrete progress by the nuclear-weapon States in implementing their obligations under the Treaty and in the full implementation of the 13 practical steps, particularly the unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear-weapon States to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals, leading to complete nuclear disarmament. The NAM States parties to the NPT call on the nuclear-weapon States to implement their obligations and undertakings, as reaffirmed by successive NPT Review Conferences.

The NAM States Parties to the NPT commend the efforts of the President of the 2010 Review Conference

of the Parties to the NPT, and consider that the conclusions and recommendations for follow-on actions of the Conference represent an outcome that can be built upon and further enhanced in the near future in order to realize a world free from nuclear weapons.

The Movement reiterates its support for the establishment in the Middle East of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, in accordance with Security Council resolution 487 (1981), paragraph 14 of Security Council resolution 687 (1991), and the relevant General Assembly resolutions adopted by consensus. The unsafeguarded nuclear capabilities of Israel are a matter of serious concern with respect to regional and international peace and security. Pending the establishment of such a zone, NAM demands that Israel, the only country in the region that has neither joined the NPT nor declared its intention to do so, renounce possession of nuclear weapons, accede to the NPT without delay, and promptly place all its nuclear facilities under the comprehensive safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

The NAM State Parties to the NPT remain seriously concerned about the lack of progress in the implementation of the 1995 NPT Review Conference resolution on the Middle East. In that context, they welcome the adoption by consensus of a detailed plan of action on the implementation of 1995 NPT Review Conference resolution on the Middle East, included in the conclusions and recommendations for follow-on actions of the 2010 NPT Review Conference, and call for its full implementation. Accordingly, they urge the Secretary General and the sponsors of the 1995 resolution, in consultation with the States of the region, to commence immediately necessary preparations to convene a conference in 2012, to be attended by all States of the Middle East, on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction.

In closing, the Movement stresses the importance of displaying political will and working collaboratively to address international disarmament issues. We are fully committed to our constructive engagement to contributing to the success of the work of this very important session of the Disarmament Commission.

Mrs. Ogwu (Nigeria): The Group of African States wishes to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as Chairperson of this year's session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. I also congratulate the members of the Bureau on their elections and assure them of the Group's full cooperation.

We welcome the always relevant and timely remarks of the United Nations High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Ambassador Sergio Duarte, and his useful contributions to discussions on disarmament. Also, on behalf the African Group, I want to express appreciation to the Chair of the 2010 session, Mr. Jean-Francis Régis Zinsou of Benin, as well as all previous Chairpersons of the Working Groups, for their remarkable contributions.

The Group stands by and commiserates with the good people of Japan on the tragic incidents of the recent earthquakes and tsunami, bearing in mind its numerous pains and attendant loss of lives. This further underscores the need for international solidarity.

The African Group aligns itself with the statement of the Non-Aligned Movement just delivered by the Permanent Representative of Indonesia, and would like to make the following comments.

The African Group underscores the unique and important position of the Disarmament Commission as the main deliberative body on disarmament in multilateral diplomacy, but regrets the lack of consensus on any substantive issue during its session of 2010. We call on all States Members of the United Nations to demonstrate sufficient political goodwill, the requisite flexibility and deep understanding with a view to achieving concrete recommendations on the issues on the agenda of Disarmament Commission.

Humankind continues to be confronted with the serious threat posed by nuclear weapons. The African Group calls for the total elimination of nuclear weapons, as provided for by the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), in a transparent, verifiable and irreversible manner. The African Group reaffirms that multilateral diplomatic negotiation, consistent with the provisions of the United Nations Charter and within the United Nations disarmament machinery, remains the most effective approach to achieving nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation in order to safeguard and strengthen international peace and security.

Nuclear weapon States should implement in good faith all their obligations and commitments under the NPT and its review process, and desist from

developing new types of nuclear weapons. Non-nuclear-weapon States should be granted unconditional negative security assurances in the framework of a legally binding instrument, as a matter of urgency.

The Group remains convinced that the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) in order to enforce a comprehensive ban on all forms of nuclear test explosions would be a concrete and meaningful step towards the realization of a systematic process to achieve nuclear disarmament. The African Group stresses the significance of achieving universal adherence to the CTBT, in particular by all nuclear weapon States, which would contribute to the achievement of nuclear disarmament.

Africa is committed to the NPT and reiterates the importance of achieving its universality once it enters into force. In this regard, the Group underlines the importance of all countries adhering to the NPT as non-nuclear weapon States.

The African Group considers the entry into force of nuclear-weapon-free zones, such as that established by the Treaty of Pelindaba, to be a valuable contribution to nuclear disarmament, non-proliferation and international security. The African Group calls upon the nuclear-weapon States and other relevant States that have not done so to ratify the Treaty's Protocols without further delay in order to ensure its effectiveness.

In the same vein, the African Group reiterates its support for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, in accordance with the resolution adopted at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of Parties to the NPT as well as relevant United Nations resolutions. In this regard, the African Group calls upon the Secretary-General, the three depository States of the NPT and all the United Nations Member States in the Middle East to support the implementation of plan of action agreed at the 2010 Review Conference. The Group further calls for the immediate commencement of necessary preparations to convene a conference in 2012, to be attended by all States in the Middle East, on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction.

Africa has paid a heavy price for the effects of the illicit transfer, manufacture, acquisition and circulation of conventional weapons, in particular small arms and light weapons. In this regard, the African Group reiterates the high importance it attaches to the effective implementation of the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. Furthermore, the Group acknowledges the need to regulate the trade in and global movement of arms in a fair, balanced and universal manner. In this context, the Group recalls the relevant General Assembly resolutions on the arms trade treaty, and notes the ongoing process towards the discussion of relevant elements of such Treaty.

Finally, the African Group wishes to appeal for a sustained and meaningful dialogue as we begin substantive debates on major issues, and looks forward to fruitful discussions to achieve the desired constructive conclusion to the present cycle Disarmament Commission.

Mr. Goledzinowski (Australia): First of all, I would like to congratulate you, Sir, and other bureau members on your election, and to express full confidence that the quality of the leadership we will have at this session will be similar to that we enjoyed under the Permanent Representative of Benin at last year's session. I pledge our delegation's strong cooperation with you.

The multilateral disarmament agenda is one of Australia's highest priorities. Disarmament has a national security and humanitarian imperative. To move the global disarmament agenda forward, we need ideas and common purpose, strong rules and norms applying to all players. Multilateral action is therefore key. The United Nations Disarmament Commission has an important role to play. It must reinforce work on long-standing arrangements, support recent achievements and undertakings, and provide encouragement and direction to areas of potential progress.

Australia is firmly committed to a world free of nuclear weapons. The success of last year's Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), and in particular its consensus adoption of a plan of action that is unprecedented in its scope and balance across the NPT's three pillars, was a crucial milestone. For our part, Australia played an active and constructive role at the Review Conference. We worked hard to inject fresh thinking. With Japan, we prepared and

submitted a package of practical measures that fit into the final set of actions. We submitted, with New Zealand, a paper calling for greater transparency in reporting by nuclear weapon States.

We were pleased that the International Commission on Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament — a joint Australia-Japan initiative — also made what we thought and hoped others believed were thoughtful and practical contributions. We must now translate this collective commitment into action. The action plan adopted at the Review Conference is a road map against which we can assess progress as we look ahead to the next review cycle in 2015.

But we must move forward now. As one practical contribution following the Review Conference, Australia established with Japan a cross-regional non-proliferation and disarmament initiative. At the first ministerial meeting in September last year, ministers adopted a forward-looking statement to advance the outcomes of the Review Conference in practical ways. We now look forward to the next ministerial meeting, to be held shortly in Berlin, which we hope will announce new measures to achieve real progress on the ground.

If we are to achieve genuine and irreversible nuclear disarmament, it is essential to cap the amount of fissile material available for nuclear weapons. The timing negotiation of a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) is essential. As a pragmatic contribution, Australia and Japan are hosting a series of expert side events in the margins of the Conference on Disarmament. These are intended to build confidence and momentum for the FMCT negotiations and to consider key issues that will need to be resolved in these negotiations. The Disarmament Commission must send a strong message of support to the Conference on Disarmament to commence negotiations on an FMCT without delay. Differences of opinion in the Conference should not prevent us from commencing negotiations, but the Conference is running out of time. If it is to fulfil its mandate, it simply cannot afford further inertia.

The 2010 NPT Review Conference underscored the importance of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) to the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime. For many years, we have worked to garner universal support for it. Our Foreign Minister, Kevin Rudd, chaired the fifth CTBT ministerial meeting in September last year, which helped to push forward commitments to advocating for the CTBT's entry into force. We urge all States yet to ratify to do so without delay, and we welcome recent positive progress made towards its entry into force.

We must give serious attention to halting the proliferation of conventional weapons. We have the opportunity to address that threat through the negotiation of a comprehensive, legally binding international arms trade treaty (ATT). We are pleased with the work of the United Nations-mandated Preparatory Committee to develop thinking on the ATT in the lead-up to formal treaty negotiations next year. We welcome the opportunity to have been a Friend of the Chair at last year's Preparatory Committee. It will be important to maintain this momentum and the spirit of consensus as we work towards 2012. Australia stands ready to assist in building capacity and consensus in support of the ATT. We have already worked with a broad range of partners in the Pacific, Africa and particularly the Caribbean and elsewhere, and will continue these efforts.

Addressing the scourge of small arms and light weapons is critical to the disarmament agenda. We are providing practical assistance to those States that have requested it to implement the United Nations United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects in order to address the proliferation of these weapons. We are pleased to be providing around $150,000 to the Scholarship Fund of the United Nations Development Programme for those delegations of developing countries that wish to attend the Meeting of Governmental Experts in May, and we are hosting workshops to help others implement the Programme of Action and prepare for future ATT.

For many years, Australia has taken a strong stand against landmines, cluster munitions and other explosive remnants of war. These continue to cause significant human suffering and to hinder human economic development. Australia is the sixth-largest contributor to mine action. We have provided some $175 million over the past 12 years for landmine clearance, rehabilitation and education in 17 countries. In 2009, we committed to a further $100 million towards this goal, and this afternoon we will be pledging a further significant sum on top of that. We encourage all States to become parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling,

Production and Transfer of Anti-personnel Mines and on Their Destruction and the Convention on Cluster Munitions, and to implement comprehensively their humanitarian objectives.

Multilateralism has long been at the heart of Australia's foreign policy; so, too, have disarmament and arms control. We have worked assiduously over many years in multilateral forums such as this to achieve a broad range of disarmament and non-proliferation objectives. We look forward to engaging in constructive debate in the Disarmament Commission to further pursue these important goals.

Mr. Diallo (Senegal) (*spoke in French*): I associate Senegal with the statements made by the representatives of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and of Nigeria on behalf of the African group. Please except, Sir, my warmest congratulations on your election as Chairman of the Disarmament Commission. At the same time, I assure you of the full support and cooperation of my delegation.

I should also like to warmly thank the outgoing Chairman, Ambassador Jean-Francis Régis Zinsou of Benin, for his laudable efforts at the previous session to advance the work of the Disarmament Commission. I should also like to congratulate the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Sergio Duarte, on his cogent comments and his important work for disarmament.

In recent years, the global disarmament and non-proliferation regime has encountered many obstacles that are severely hampering the progress that Member States have a right to expect in this field. The stalemate in the disarmament forums must give rise to a serious multilateral diplomatic effort in order to provide a collective and effective response to the security challenges the world is facing. Indeed, unilateralism and the pursuit of purely national interests can lead only to distrust, suspicion, misunderstanding, defiance and confrontation. We must bear in mind the sound conviction that security is either global or it is nothing at all.

With the success of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), held in May 2010, and the conclusion of the New START agreement by the two major nuclear Powers, we have seen a few glimmers of hope. Other promising events were the convening of the Security Council summit of 24 September 2009 (see S/PV.6191) and the High-level Meeting on Revitalizing the Work of the Conference on Disarmament and Taking Forward Multilateral Disarmament Negotiations of 24 September 2010, organized by the Secretary-General, as well as the entry into force in August 2010 of the Convention on Cluster Munitions. This new positive momentum has led to renewed enthusiasm for general and complete disarmament. There is no better moment to lay new grounds for even more substantive progress. To that end, we must pay the closest attention to the following points.

First, we must reaffirm the will to rid the world of nuclear weapons as a major objective that must enjoy the support of all States. Second, we must strengthen the NPT, including through its universalization. Third, the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation machinery must be completed as soon as possible through the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and the negotiation and adoption of a binding instrument banning the production of fissile material and a nuclear weapons convention. Fourth, the nuclear-weapon States must agree on an irreversible universal, verifiable and more ambitious programme to reduce their arsenals, and grant non-nuclear-weapon States security assurances through a binding instrument.

Fifth, we must also encourage greater support for nuclear-weapon-free zones, which contribute decisively to strengthening confidence and stability. In that regard, we call on all actors to act in good faith for the proper implementation of the conclusions of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT concerning the convening in 2012 of a conference on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East.

Sixth, we must also reaffirm the right of countries to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and ensure the effective and safe transfer of relevant technologies to States that honour their obligations under the NPT. That would require strengthening the authority and capacities of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Seven, we must ensure better control of conventional weapons. In that respect, we welcome the progress made at the second session of the Preparatory Committee for the 2012 United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty. We also eagerly await the

convening of a conventional weapons summit by the Security Council in line with which took place in 2009 on nuclear weapons.

Senegal also calls for the International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons to become legally binding. We also seek the implementation of the Outcome Document (A/CONF.192/BMS/2010/3) of the Fourth Biennial Meeting of States to Consider the Implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects.

In conclusion, allow me to express the hope that all delegations will demonstrate imagination and flexibility so that we can finally adopt, at the outcome of this session, clear and effective recommendations leading to the implementation of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, a declaration of the 2010s as the second disarmament decade, and confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons.

Mr. Kodama (Japan): At the outset, allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as Chairman of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, and all the other members of the Bureau. The delegation of Japan looks forward to working with you and the members of the Bureau at this session.

Secondly, I would like to express my deepest appreciation to Nigerian Ambassador Ogwu, representing the African Group, for her words of condolence, sympathy and support for the people and Government of Japan in response to the Pacific Ocean earthquake. The Japanese people, let me assure the Commission, will mobilize their wisdom, courage and hope to recover from these challenging circumstances. Through their collective efforts and with assistance from all over the world they will successfully overcome these trying times. On behalf of the people and the Government of Japan, I should like once again to express my deepest appreciation for the tremendous outpouring of cordial assistance and support from all over the world.

Since last year, we have witnessed significant progress in the area of nuclear disarmament and arms control. The 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) concluded here in New York with the unanimous adoption of a comprehensive and forward-looking Final Document (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol. I)) setting out an action plan. Japan also welcomes the entry into force of the New START treaty between the United States and Russia. These, among others, are significant accomplishments and a testament to the new enthusiasm for disarmament. Yet we still face ongoing disarmament and non-proliferation issues, such as the nuclear programmes of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which compel us to maintain and intensify this momentum for nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation.

Japan believes that the newly established cross-regional initiative on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, initiated by Japan and Australia, is also contributing to maintaining and enhancing momentum in these fields. Japan is convinced that, once these endeavours begin to see steady progress, disarmament and non-proliferation will be comprehensively advanced and the 2010s will be a remarkable decade for these issues. In this regard, the declaration of the 2010s as the fourth disarmament decade should outline the important principles in the broad areas of disarmament and non-proliferation in a concise and well balanced manner.

A practical approach and concrete measures should be taken in order to achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons. This, I believe, is the shared goal of all Member States represented here today. General Assembly resolution 65/72, entitled "United action towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons", which Japan submitted to the Assembly last year and which was adopted with a record number of sponsors and overwhelming support, including from some nuclear-weapon States, bears witness to the high level of international support for this goal. Towards this end, Japan attaches great importance to the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). In this regard, we welcome the commitment made by the United States to pursue ratification of the Treaty and the announcement by Indonesia that it will initiate the ratification process. Japan hopes that the remaining States listed in annex 2 will soon follow suit and proceed to the early ratification of the Treaty.

Japan also considers negotiation of a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) as the next logical and critical step to be undertaken after the CTBT for achieving this goal. We strongly call for the immediate commencement of negotiations in the Conference on

Disarmament in this regard. Japan and Australia recently co-hosted expert side events in Geneva for the purpose of advancing the substantive discussions on a FMCT.

Conventional weapons continue to cause widespread loss of life around the world. Japan places great importance on the role of the existing confidence-building mechanisms concerning conventional weapons within the framework of the United Nations, such as the Register of Conventional Arms and the instrument for reporting military expenditures.

Japan has long been actively engaged on the issue of small arms and light weapons, submitting a draft resolution on this important issue to the General Assembly almost every year since 1995 and jointly with Colombia and South Africa since 2001. This year, we will once again present a draft resolution that defines a path for the follow-up to the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects.

Moreover, as one of the original sponsors of the resolution on an arms trade treaty, Japan has consistently supported the negotiation of such a treaty as a way to ensure the responsible transfer of weaponry. It is essential that we enhance the current level of preparatory work in order to conclude an instrument by the end of 2012.

Despite the importance of the United Nations Disarmament Commission in the area of multilateral discussions on disarmament, the Commission has not been able to produce any substantive outcomes in recent years. This is especially regrettable in the light of its history of producing various useful guidelines and recommendations. As it is now in the third and final year of its three-year cycle of deliberations, the Commission must conduct this session's work over the next three weeks proactively so as to issue meaningful recommendations. We should all strive to adopt a draft declaration at an early stage and to generate renewed momentum towards the goals of disarmament and non-proliferation.

Mrs. Dunlop (Brazil): I would like to congratulate you, Sir, on your election to your important position and reaffirm the readiness of the Brazilian delegation to collaborate with you. I also take this opportunity to commend the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Ambassador Sergio Duarte, for his excellent work and in particular for his ability to bridge differences in pursuit of our common goal of promoting progress on the disarmament agenda.

Brazil fully associates itself with the statement made by the representative of Chile on behalf of the Rio Group.

Allow me once again to express our sorrow and condolences to the Japanese people for their suffering. Brazil reiterates its confidence in the prompt recovery of that country, with which we share so much in our society.

The United Nations Disarmament Commission, as a deliberative body with universal participation, has the important role of debating the most pressing issues on the disarmament agenda. In the past, it was able to produce guidelines and adopt recommendations that responded to the mandate given to it. Due to a lack of political will and to difficulties in bridging differences, this has not been the case for the past decade.

At this session of the Disarmament Commission, three issues will be discussed, pursuant to General Assembly resolution 65/86: recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons; elements of a draft declaration of the 2010s as the fourth disarmament decade; and practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons. Since this is the last session of the three-year cycle of work of the Commission, Brazil hopes that it can yield substantive results.

Nuclear weapons cannot be justified in the twenty-first century, if ever they could have been. The concept of nuclear deterrence, created during the long-gone period of the Cold War, has lost its strategic significance, as it is no longer crucial for military purposes. Politically and morally, it has become unsustainable.

Nuclear disarmament has gained some momentum in the last couple of years, with the ratification of the New START treaty and the positive outcome of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Brazil believes that the time has come to begin negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention that would prohibit those arms and lead to their irreversible, transparent and verifiable destruction, according to an agreed legal framework and specified

timelines. Such negotiations will surely call for extensive efforts, but the first step towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons must be taken.

In addition to supporting full negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention, Brazil favours some intermediate actions. Negative security assurances must be given to non-nuclear States. Unilateral declarations do not suffice. Instead, we need to negotiate a multilateral agreement on negative security assurances. The necessity of such a comprehensive agreement arises from, among other things, the fact that several protocols of nuclear-weapon-free zones were signed by nuclear-weapon States with reservations.

Brazil also welcomes the decision of the Eighth NPT Review Conference to encourage the establishment of new nuclear-weapon-free zones on the basis of freely negotiated agreements among the States of the region concerned. We would also like to draw attention to the important decision to hold a Conference in 2012 on the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East.

Another important step towards nuclear disarmament would be the negotiation in the Conference on Disarmament of a verifiable treaty to ban the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices, which must take into consideration existing stocks and prohibit future production. It is important that the Disarmament Commission support such measures.

This session of the Disarmament Commission will also discuss the elements of a draft declaration of the 2010s as the fourth disarmament decade. In order to fulfil its mandate, the Commission should take into consideration the commitments made by nuclear-weapon States in the Final Document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol. I)). In Brazil's view, the declaration should reflect the priority that we all attach to nuclear disarmament. The total elimination of nuclear weapons must be a clear and unconditional goal. We emphasize the importance of the ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty by States that have not yet done so.

With regard to the disarmament machinery, Brazil believes that the declaration should support the holding of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. It should be a broad review of the machinery that was created by the first special session, where the United Nations should continue to support the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral body for negotiations on disarmament.

The declaration of the 2010s as the fourth disarmament decade should also address relevant issues in the field of conventional weapons, such as the arms trade treaty and the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects.

In accordance with resolution 65/86, once the declaration has been concluded, the Disarmament Commission should consider the issue of practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons. It is important to highlight that such measures aim to correct misperceptions and misunderstandings about military actions and policies that might otherwise lead to conflict. They may gradually foster stable political and diplomatic relations and reframe parties' ideas about their security needs. They may even encourage initiatives to identify shared security interests in a manner conducive to a better appreciation of the importance of effective disarmament.

Brazil supports the Register of Conventional Arms, the Standardized Instrument for Reporting Military Expenditures and the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. An arms trade treaty would also contribute to confidence-building in the area of conventional arms. The Disarmament Commission should encourage more cooperation among military authorities and promote seminars with the participation of experts from various countries.

In conclusion, I wish to reassure you, Sir, of the readiness of my delegation to work with you and the members of the Bureau to ensure the successful outcome of this session.

Mr. Haroon (Pakistan): Let me congratulate you, Sir, and the other members of the Bureau on your election, and to express our gratitude to Ambassador Sergio Duarte. Pakistan aligns itself with the statement made by my friend the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. There is a time limit, so I will not read out my entire speech, but only an abridged version, as certain matters need to be

elucidated here today as our long-hoped-for goals for peace and a just international order remain elusive.

In the area of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, to my mind, there have been several recent negative developments. Those include, first, the fact that nuclear-weapon States seem unready for a zero-nuclear-weapons option. Secondly, contrary to the rhetoric we have heard this morning, many, including nuclear-weapon States, are resisting the commencement of negotiations on nuclear disarmament in the Conference on Disarmament. Thirdly, there are blatant violations of national and international non-proliferation rules and obligations by the international community, including the pursuit of selectivity, exceptionalism, discrimination and double standards, guided by commercial and national strategic considerations. Fourthly, there is a widening gap between the major Powers and the defence capacity of smaller States due to the development of anti-ballistic-missile systems, the steady militarization of outer space and the build-up of conventional forces by major Powers. Lastly, there is a growing lack of credibility when it comes to nuclear security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States.

Nuclear disarmament is today a core issue around which all other security issues revolve. Multilateral deliberations on important platforms, such as the Commission, offer the wider international community the only mechanism to address the perceived threats posed to the international community's security and stability by nuclear weapons. Hence it is of great importance.

While some powerful nations assert that today's global environment is more favourable for progress towards nuclear disarmament and stress their own commitment to nuclear zero, they are surprisingly opposed to the Conference on Disarmament engaging in negotiations on this core issue. This contradiction is now a dilemma for this house. The total — and, I reiterate, total — elimination of nuclear weapons is the only guarantee of durable peace and security for the international community.

In principle, nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation must remain synonymous, because the international legitimacy of the goal of nuclear non-proliferation only gains recognition when it leads towards the greater goal of nuclear disarmament. But can the goals of non-proliferation be achieved while a small, elite club continues to possess nuclear weapons indefinitely? Is the NPT meant to divide the world perpetually into States that possess nuclear weapons and those that do not? I do not think that was the principle upon which it was founded.

As we know, the Disarmament Commission was created at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (SSOD-I) to serve as a forum for all Member States to deliberate on major disarmament issues. Some dismissively scoff that the Commission has not lived up to its potential role. Their motives are clear. They deliberately lower the Commission's relevance. Is that a failure of the disarmament machinery or is it our own bleak failure of political will to promote the disarmament and non-proliferation agenda?

The current session of the Commission has three items on its agenda, which need to be discussed. We hope that the Commission will be able to reconcile the differences in perspectives, approaches and modalities among Member States while deliberating on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation issues. We also expect that the Disarmament Commission will be able to revive prospects for effective nuclear and conventional disarmament and its meaningful contribution to international and regional peace and security.

For the sake of our international brotherhood, the issue of negative security assurances is an integral component of the debate on disarmament and non-proliferation. The unattended demand for such security assurances has been on the international arms control and disarmament agenda since the 1960s, without tangible result. We hope that the Disarmament Commission will now add its voice in underscoring the urgency of negotiations on this important subject.

Space has become an imperative, not an option. The militarization and weaponization of space must be prevented, or its ability to destroy planet Earth will be the last battle. The proposals made by the Russian Federation and China provide a good basis to start work on this issue in the Conference on Disarmament.

We also share the global concern with regard to the unbridled proliferation of ballistic missiles. To avert it, Pakistan calls for enhanced efforts to conclude a comprehensive, non-discriminatory and universally negotiated treaty within the United Nations system covering all aspects of missiles.

Pakistan's views on a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) have been clearly articulated and are well known. Let me reaffirm that no State can be expected to refute its credible threat perceptions and engage in disarmament, arms control or non-proliferation negotiations if the very initiation of such negotiations undermine its basic and core security interests. For that obvious reason, the Conference on Disarmament, as part of the international disarmament machinery, works on the basis of consensus, which aims to ensure the equal security of all States. That is a principle that we espouse.

Having said that, let me highlight that the present focus on an FMCT follows a regular pattern of negotiating only those agreements that do not undermine or compromise the security interests of certain powerful States. We observe a similar pattern when it comes to the Biological Weapons Convention, Chemical Weapons Convention and even the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). Let me therefore suggest to the Commission that, only after possessing vast numbers of nuclear weapons, were the major Powers convinced of the need to make biological and chemical-weapon systems internationally superfluous and redundant. In the case of CTBT, only after carrying out a sufficient number of nuclear tests did it dawn upon them that testing was unnecessary. It seems that an inequitable principle has been achieved. What is mine is mine; for others it is not necessary.

The same is the case with the FMCT. Having developed huge stockpiles of nuclear weapons and stocks of fissile material, the major Powers are ready to conclude a treaty that will only ban the future production of fissile material. For a fissile material treaty to genuinely advance the goals of disarmament and non-proliferation, it should not just ban future production bilaterally but also provide for the reduction of stocks multilaterally and take a broader, credible approach to the issues of the definition, scope and verification of fissile materials. That has not been done.

At the same time, let me reiterate that pending agreement on negotiating an FMCT, the Conference on Disarmament should begin substantive work, including negotiations on nuclear disarmament and a treaty on negative security assurances. Those are items on which the vast majority of the membership of the United Nations agrees that legally binding multilateral treaties should be concluded at the earliest possible time. We hope that deliberations on the second item on the Commission's agenda will help to achieve a comprehensive, balanced, forward-looking and principle-based outcome.

While international attention is focused on the need to control weapons of mass destruction, the trade and military expenditures in conventional weapons continue to rise. In 1978, SSOD-I characterized global military expenditure as a colossal waste of resources. In the past 10 years, such expenditures have multiplied so many times over that we can only call it an even worse colossal waste of resources. Ironically, the weapons that fuel conflicts are not manufactured in zones of war, but in the havens that enjoy the greatest peace. A further complicating factor is the development of advanced conventional weapons with lethality approaching that of weapons of mass destruction.

In view of those disturbing trends, it is now imperative to pursue conventional arms control, even at the lowest possible levels of armaments and military forces, in order to promote peace and discourage huge collateral damage in the form of human lives. However, all conventional arms control efforts must be pursued verifiably in both the regional and subregional contexts, as most threat perceptions arise mainly in contiguous States and regions.

The General Assembly has regularly adopted a resolution entitled "Conventional arms control at the regional and subregional levels". That is a good sign. Those resolutions request the Conference on Disarmament to consider formulating the principles that can serve as a framework for regional agreements on conventional arms control. The General Assembly also annually adopts a consensus resolution entitled "Confidence-building measures in the regional and subregional context". We hope that the Disarmament Commission will draw on those resolutions in preparing recommendations on confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons.

In conclusion, only by reviving the level of commitment of the international community that led to SSOD-I and by giving due importance to the various facets of the international security agenda will we be able to help realize the shared objectives of disarmament and non-proliferation in both the nuclear and the conventional fields. Pakistan strongly supports the call of the 119 members of the Non-Aligned Movement to convene the fourth special session of the

General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which would evolve a global consensus on all of those issues.

Mr. Kamau (Kenya): I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as Chair of this session of the Disarmament Commission. My delegation assures you of its full cooperation. At the outset, let me associate myself with the statement made by the representative of Nigeria on behalf of the African Group and by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. I daresay that I might also associate myself with some of the sentiments expressed by my Pakistani colleague.

The Disarmament Commission, as the sole deliberative body of the disarmament machinery, has tremendous potential to advance multilateral negotiations on disarmament issues. Last year's session of the Disarmament Commission gave delegations space and time to undertake intensive deliberations, albeit without reaching a common agreement on anything of real substance. However, that should not lead us to despair, but rather give us the resolve to soldier on in the current session with the aim of making progress. Members need to move beyond seemingly intractable procedural matters that eventually prevent discussion and agreement on substantive issues.

In that regard, my delegation would like to emphasize several points. On nuclear disarmament, Kenya recognizes that nuclear weapons still represent the greatest threat to humanity and therefore calls for the total elimination of nuclear weapons as the surest guarantee of saving mankind from the effects of such weapons.

My country has always held the belief that multilateral engagement, under the provisions of the United Nations Charter, remains the most effective means of achieving credible universal nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation so as to safeguard and strengthen international peace and security.

We urge nuclear-weapon States to exercise due diligence in implementing all of their obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and other international treaties, and to desist from developing new types of nuclear weapons. We also encourage the international community to continue to strive towards the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.

Kenya salutes the entry into force of the regional nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties, including the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty. We call on all African States that have not yet signed or ratified the Treaty to do so urgently.

Kenya calls on all Member States to demonstrate the necessary political will and cooperation so that we may begin to see movement towards fulfilling the concrete recommendations in the field of disarmament and international peace and security that all of us have been pursuing for decades.

Concerning conventional weapons, the illicit trade and proliferation of small arms and light weapons continues to preoccupy my country and our entire region, as it has a negative effect on security and development. In that context, Kenya is a strong supporter of the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects. Kenya has also consistently supported the search for a legally binding arms trade treaty to govern arms transfers so as to ensure that legitimately traded arms do not end up on the illicit market.

In that regard, we are pleased that the international community has agreed that international action is needed to address the unregulated trade in conventional weapons. Kenya strongly supports the convening of the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty, to be held in 2012. We note with satisfaction the positive work undertaken in the two most recent meetings of the Preparatory Committee for the Conference and look forward to meaningful deliberations during its forthcoming meetings.

Finally, taking a cue from last year's session, where members held discussions in an atmosphere of mutual respect and tolerance, we appeal for the same spirit to prevail during the current session so that it will be possible to move forward with our important task.

We realize that the issues involved are extremely complex and cannot be divorced from political realities. However, we have no alternative but to rededicate ourselves to facing those enormous challenges in a bid to advance the disarmament agenda.

Mr. Momen (Bangladesh): Let me begin by congratulating you, Mr. Chair, and the Bureau on your well-deserved elections. I am confident that your able leadership and wisdom will guide our work in the

Commission to fruition. I also thank the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs for his important statement.

Bangladesh aligns itself with the statement made by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Given the current encouraging developments in the field of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, this session's work could be critical in guiding and advancing our disarmament agenda. The necessary political will seems to be making a difference. We are encouraged by the pronouncements emanating from different capitals on their promises to substantively advance the nuclear disarmament agenda. As President of the first session of the Conference on Disarmament in 2010, Bangladesh tried its best to bring all parties together.

Bangladesh never had any illusion about the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) remaining the cornerstone of the nuclear non-proliferation regime or the essential foundation for the pursuit of nuclear disarmament and for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. The Security Council has reconfirmed that. Bangladesh reiterates its call, as also reflected in Security Council resolution 1887 (2009), on States that are not parties to the NPT to accede to the Treaty as non-nuclear-weapon States so as to achieve its universality at an early date and, pending their accession to the Treaty, to adhere to its terms.

Bangladesh calls for adopting a balanced approach in addressing the three pillars of the NPT. Those are the nuclear disarmament of countries currently possessing nuclear weapons, non-proliferation in countries not yet in possession and the peaceful use of nuclear energy by all. Bangladesh also reiterates its call on all States, in particular the remaining annex 2 nations, to refrain from conducting nuclear-test explosions and to sign and ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). I am pleased to report that Bangladesh is the first South Asian annex 2 nation to join the CTBT. We are convinced that the universalization and early entry into force of the CTBT is a critical building block for a nuclear-free world.

Bangladesh also calls on the parties to the NPT, pursuant to article VI of the Treaty, to undertake to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to nuclear arms and disarmament, and on a Treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control. Bangladesh further calls on all other States to join in that endeavour.

Bangladesh supports the Secretary-General's five-point proposal on nuclear disarmament. I am happy to note that, last year, the Bangladeshi Parliament unanimously passed a resolution supporting nuclear and general disarmament and calling for a nuclear-weapons convention. The resolution further urged all the world's Governments and national parliaments to support the United Nations initiative. The resolution reflected Bangladesh's policy in favour of a world free of nuclear weapons. It reiterated our nation's full support for nuclear disarmament, non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. More important, the resolution also called upon countries with nuclear-weapon capacities to divert the $100 billion they spend annually on nuclear weapons programmes to climate change adaptation programmes and to the achievement of the United Nations Millennium Development Goals.

Bangladesh, a country constitutionally committed to general and complete disarmament, enjoys an impeccable record in disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear and conventional weapons. We are a party to almost all United Nations disarmament and non-proliferation instruments and make endeavours, within our limited resources, towards their full implementation at the national, regional and international levels.

We would like to emphasize here that while we support all non-discriminatory efforts towards nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, Bangladesh recognizes the inalienable right of the parties to the NPT, as stipulated in article IV of the Treaty, to develop, research, production and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination and in conformity with articles I and II of the Treaty. Bangladesh, for example, has consciously and unconditionally opted to remain non-nuclear. We are currently working on making good use of the NPT provision on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy to improve the living standard of our people, under the guidance of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Bangladesh has also concluded a safeguards agreement with the IAEA, including the additional protocol, as part of our commitment to non-proliferation.

While we must continue to work on eliminating weapons of mass destruction from the face of planet Earth, we must not lose sight of the perennial threats posed by the proliferation of conventional weapons, including small arms and light weapons. Bangladesh lends its support to the global effort being made to conclude an arms trade treaty to ensure the transparent transfer of conventional weapons.

Bangladesh also calls for putting an end to the use of anti-personnel landmines. Many civilians, including children and women, have fallen victim to landmines in conflict and post-conflict situations. Bangladesh has fulfilled its obligations under the Landmine Convention by destroying its stockpile. We call upon all States that have not yet done so to accede to the Ottawa Convention. Assistance should also be extended in mine-clearance operations and for the rehabilitation of victims in affected countries.

Finally, we have good reason to be more hopeful than ever about making progress in the disarmament and non-proliferation agenda. This can indeed be a time for looking beyond what has been perceived to be achievable all these years and to work for an ambitious disarmament agenda to make the planet a safer place for all of us and, more important, for future generations.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

United Nations A/CN.10/PV.311

General Assembly

Official Records

Disarmament Commission

311th meeting

Monday, 4 April 2011, 3 p.m.

New York

Chair: Mr. Al Bayati ..... (Iraq)

The meeting was called to order at 3.12 p.m.

General debate (*continued*)

Mr. Seruhere (United Republic of Tanzania): Mr. Chairman, I wish to join those who spoke before me in congratulating you for presiding over this session. I also congratulate the Bureau on its election to assist you in leading these deliberations to a successful conclusion. It was agreed last September, during the High-level Plenary Meeting of the sixty-fifth session of the General Assembly on the Millennium Development Goals, that the Disarmament Commission must be revitalized and be seen to work and contribute effectively to the fulfilment of the primary responsibility of the United Nations, that is, the maintenance of international peace and security, as enshrined in Article 1 of the Charter.

Why do we need disarmament now? This session of the Disarmament Commission comes on the heels of the global economic and financial crisis. It is also the first session after the leading nuclear-weapon States — the United States and the Russian Federation — took positive and practical steps towards nuclear disarmament. Participants will recall that the Heads of State of those two nations agreed in April 2010 that their Governments shall reduce their nuclear weapons significantly, targeting complete disarmament. In principle, they indicated to humanity as a whole that it is as possible as it is desirable to have a world free of nuclear weapons, and, indeed, other weapons of mass destruction. A window of opportunity for disarmament has been opened; no one should close it.

The need for disarmament is paramount today for two major reasons: one is to stop the damage that war and conflicts have inflicted on the global economy, and, more important, the loss of lives. Since the Second World War, regional wars and intra-State armed conflicts have increased, wreaking havoc on and causing untold suffering for the world population. They have also caused instability and the proliferation of weapons, including small arms and light weapons, and facilitated a rise in crime levels.

Small arms and light weapons have also been used to perpetrate horrendous acts of cruelty globally, particularly through acts of terrorism, piracy and violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms. So however one looks at it, armaments promote negative practices against humanity

The United Republic of Tanzania also supports the view held by many Member States that there is a nexus between security and development. With regard to nuclear disarmament, this nexus can be sustained by upholding the third pillar of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), namely, the peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

A great deal of resources are used to develop and deploy armaments, and even more so in the case of nuclear weapons, other weapons of mass destruction and conventional weapons, including small arms in all their aspects.

Disarmament is the way forward if we wish to save those resources and ensure unlimited security. Those resources, if saved, could be used to help

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

11-28788 (E)

Please recycle

emerging and potential nuclear States, as well as States which possess resources for nuclear use, in developing related technology and ensuring security and environmental protection.

We welcome the continued support mentioned by the representatives of the European Union and Australia with regard to action against landmines. Anti-personnel mines, explosives and unexploded ordnance are a major cause of insecurity and loss of life. That slows and even reverses development. The United Republic of Tanzania, in cooperation with a Belgian non-governmental organization known as APOPO, has developed a very-low-cost, environmentally friendly technology for the detection of unexploded ordnance by using giant African rats. The project is known as SUA-APOPO. I invite the Disarmament Commission to consider using this technology in disarmament, particularly in mine detection.

Disarmament is possible in our lifetime. Let us make it happen.

Ms. Aitimova (Kazakhstan): I would like to congratulate you, Sir — our colleague the Permanent Representative of Iraq — on your assumption of the chairmanship of the Disarmament Commission, as well as other members of the Bureau on their election. My delegation wishes to assure you of its full support and constructive engagement as you skilfully guide us through the deliberations ahead of us. I should like to express my deep appreciation to all participants in connection with our election to the vice-chairmanship of the Commission.

I am highly optimistic that the work of the Commission at this session will be more fruitful than it was at the previous one. I believe that in today's world, which is not so quiet or simple, we must be somewhat optimistic or we will not be able to move forward. We must do something; there are many, many things in our Governments' hands today.

I should like also to thank the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs for its untiring efforts to support the work of the Commission.

Since its independence, Kazakhstan has taken a principled stand on nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, contributing actively to the global multilateral effort. The country voluntarily renounced nuclear weapons and closed the Semipalatinsk nuclear-test site, the second-largest in the world, on 29 August 1991, and continues to promote initiatives aimed at reducing nuclear weapons with a view to their total abolition, especially this year, during the twentieth anniversary of the closure of the test site.

At our initiative, the General Assembly adopted resolution 64/35 on 2 December 2009, declaring 29 August as the International Day against Nuclear Tests. Numerous activities and projects are being undertaken throughout the year to galvanize momentum to ban nuclear tests and to move towards a world free of nuclear weapons. The Day is my country's vital contribution to the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and to the strengthening of the verification mechanism of this agreement. The country is equally committed to further enhancing the universality of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and is actively working on promoting the implementation of some of the key action plans arising from the May 2010 NPT Review Conference.

Kazakhstan, along with other countries of the region, has been instrumental in the creation of the Central Asian nuclear-weapon-free zone, which came into force on 21 March 2009, and plays a key role in strengthening regional and international peace and security arrangements. We urge the nuclear-weapon States to take the steps necessary for the early signing of the Protocol as a legally binding instrument for negative security assurances. The country is also making efforts nationally and within the region by developing a rigorous action plan to ensure the physical security of nuclear materials and equipment so as to prevent nuclear proliferation and terrorism.

Kazakhstan is committed to the formation of nuclear-weapon free zones and advocates the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, convinced that such a measure will lead to dialogue, peace, cooperation and trust in the entire Middle East region. We also believe that the nuclear-weapon-free zones in Central Asia, Latin America, Africa and South-east Asia will inspire other regions of the world as well so that our entire planet can become one common zone of peace and security.

My country considers it necessary to begin the process of drafting the fissile material cut-off treaty in the Conference on Disarmament. The country will join

others in mobilizing political will so as to make the Conference an effective part of the disarmament machinery, so that it can commence work on this important treaty and begin to address other pending issues on its work agenda.

We share the vision of countries around the world of a convention against nuclear weapons becoming a reality. My President, Nursultan Nazarbayev, has proposed the idea of a universal declaration of a nuclear-weapon-free world as a first step, leading gradually to a convention that could be an interim measure. Indeed, it is much better to do something, to go step by step, slowly but surely. We have no choice; we must succeed.

I wish to note here that President Nazarbayev was re-elected yesterday for five years with 95.5 per cent of the vote, according to preliminary reports.

Kazakhstan, the largest producer of uranium, which possesses the expertise and capacity to process highly enriched uranium into its low-enriched form, will host the nuclear fuel bank. Permission has been obtained in this respect from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and the fuel bank will operate under its surveillance. My country reiterates its support for the legitimate and inalienable right of each State party to the NPT to develop and use peaceful nuclear energy in compliance with all the requirements of the IAEA and the NPT.

Kazakhstan fully upholds the effective implementation of Security Council sanctions in the field of nuclear non-proliferation, with a view to averting the negative effects of nuclear threats to the maximum extent possible.

Last year, during its chairmanship of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), Kazakhstan undertook regional security measures to support those of the United Nations. The country promoted the implementation of the OSCE Athens Ministerial Declaration on the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and on strengthening the Corfu process on the future of Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian security. The OSCE summit in Astana, held late last year, was aimed at reinforcing global and regional efforts, and this year, as Chair of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, we will pursue efforts in the same direction.

Convinced of the need to consolidate and strengthen efforts against the proliferation of illicit small arms and light weapons through legally binding instruments, Kazakhstan is committed to lending its full support to the implementation of the recommendations of the Fourth Biennial Meeting of States to Consider the Implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, held last June in New York.

My country welcomes the commencement of negotiations on the Arms Trade Treaty and will participate actively in the preparatory sessions in 2011, with a view to ensuring a successful outcome to the 2012 Conference on the Treaty.

We believe that promoting disarmament on all fronts would also help to address other critical challenges facing the international community, including achieving the Millennium Development Goals, reducing poverty and promoting human dignity and well-being, as well as ensuring the protection of our precious planet.

The Chair: I thank the Permanent Representative of Kazakhstan for the kind words she addressed to me. I agree with her that we have to be optimistic. With the support of the Bureau, the Secretariat and representatives, hopefully we will be able to go forward with this session.

Mr. Benmehidi (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): Allow me at the outset, Sir, to extend the warmest congratulations of the Algerian delegation on your election to the chairmanship of the Disarmament Commission and to assure you of our full support. We would like also to congratulate the other members of the Bureau of the Commission as well as the Chairs of the Working Groups. My delegation would in particular like to welcome the very relevant briefing given by Mr. Sergio Duarte, United Nations High Representative for Disarmament Affairs.

Algeria associates itself with the statements made by the representatives of Indonesia and Nigeria on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Group of African States, respectively.

The 2011 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission is especially important because it is taking place at the end of a cycle. It is therefore an

opportunity that we should take advantage of so that our work will end on a positive note through the adoption of highly awaited recommendations. To that end, our in-depth discussions must be driven by a true spirit of cooperation and a constructive attitude. It is useful to point out in that respect that the Disarmament Commission, as a unique deliberative body, is an important component of the disarmament machinery.

The agenda of the current session covers three important and specific questions, and it is likely, this time, to yield positive and promising results, especially since the global context of recent months has been encouraging. We must therefore continue this dynamic and make progress on the international disarmament agenda. I would like to assure the Commission that Algeria will spare no effort to contribute to the success of the Commission's work, which we see as a specialized deliberative body of the United Nations multilateral mechanism with an irreplaceable role in considering disarmament issues, including nuclear disarmament.

With respect to Working Group I, on nuclear disarmament, Algeria reiterates its principled position on the ultimate goal of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, namely, the total elimination of nuclear weapons. In the current state of affairs, it is clear that much remains to be done to rid the work of such weapons. Indeed, the very existence of nuclear weapons poses an ongoing danger for humankind as a whole, which the persistence of military doctrines of certain nuclear-weapon States tends to perpetuate.

This situation is a serious source of concern for the vast majority of Member States. That is why the effective and ongoing commitment of the international community as a whole, in particular that of nuclear-weapon States, is crucial in order to achieve that goal, in accordance with article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the commitments made by States at the 1995, 2000 and 2010 Review Conferences, including the 13 practical measures adopted by consensus in the year 2000.

In order to assess the progress possible in this area, it is crucial that nuclear disarmament measures be carried out in accordance with the principles of transparency, verifiability and irreversibility. Although nuclear non-proliferation is one of the pillars of the NPT, Algeria also calls for the effective and gradual implementation of article VI of the NPT by nuclear-weapon States. We also recall the importance that we place on abiding by the provisions of article IV, on the rights of States to research, develop and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The NPT's three pillars, which are mutually reinforcing, ensure the necessary balance of that instrument.

My delegation would like to stress that efforts aimed at non-proliferation must be deployed at the same time as those targeting nuclear disarmament. Furthermore, the conclusion of an international legally binding instrument through which nuclear-weapon States would grant security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States continues to be of the highest priority. That is why it is on the agenda of the Conference on Disarmament. I should point out in that regard that the discussions begun in the Conference on Disarmament once again foundered on the question of the programme of work. In any case, the programme of work adopted by consensus in 2009 under the Algerian chairmanship remains the appropriate reference.

At the regional level, the 2010 NPT Review Conference relaunched the implementation of the 1995 resolution on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. We therefore believe that it is important to begin as soon as possible the necessary preparations for the organization of the conference in 2012.

With regard to the Working Group on the elements for a draft declaration of the 2010s as the fourth disarmament decade, we should make every effort to conclude this exercise so as to be able to launch the decade in a timely manner. It is therefore crucial to reach an agreement on the elements to be proposed to the General Assembly at its next session. Algeria believes that, so long as all delegations have the political will, momentum exists for the adoption of a declaration that is broader is scope and more ambitious in its objectives. My delegation therefore believes that the draft declaration should include the following elements.

It should reaffirm the need to achieve the total elimination of weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons; include the principles of transparency, verifiability and irreversibility and reaffirm the central role played by the United Nations as a universal, multilateral framework to review disarmament issues. The draft declaration should also underscore the particularly adverse consequences of

the arms race and the immense resources that it swallows up, which could be devoted, among other things, to development, the fight against poverty, disease and climate change. It should underscore the importance of adopting universally agreed standards in the area of conventional weapons. And, lastly, it should reiterate the commitment of the international community towards the prevention of, and the fight against, the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons and its catastrophic humanitarian consequences.

With regard to concrete confidence-building measures in the area of conventional weapons, we welcome the establishment of Working Group III, tasked with proposing specific recommendations on confidence-building measures. This item is to be taken up once the elements for the draft declaration are defined, which has not yet been done. With respect to deadlines, the Algerian delegation believes that progress must be made on this item in order to move on to the third item.

Given all of the challenges that arise in the area of disarmament in all of its aspects and the stalemate at the level of certain mechanisms, Algeria reiterates its position on the need to organize the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, as set out in resolution 65/66, which decided to establish an open-ended working group in 2011 and 2012 to review the goals and agenda for the session and to set up a preparatory committee.

This 2011 session, the last of the three-year cycle, is therefore critical in many ways. Aware of the stakes entailed, Algeria approaches the current session with the desire to fully contribute with all Member States to the adoption of specific recommendations on the three items on the Commission's agenda, whose mandate can only be the stronger for it.

Mr. Kvarnström (Sweden): Let me first congratulate you, Mr. Chair, and the members of the Bureau on your assumption of your positions. You will find Sweden a constructive partner in supporting your efforts.

Sweden fully aligns itself with the statement made by the representative of Hungary on behalf of the European Union. I will not repeat its contents but rather add some observations from my national perspective.

The Disarmament Commission was created to be the deliberative body on disarmament matters for the full membership of the General Assembly. One of its functions is to consider and make recommendations on problems in the field of disarmament. However, it is a fact that, for more than a decade, the Commission has failed to make any substantial recommendation. It is true that the deliberations have been vigorous and that they have clearly shown where the divisions among us are drawn. But if they are not moving us forward through concrete recommendations, they fail to add much value to discussion elsewhere, such as in the First Committee. Perhaps we are due for a discussion on our methods of work.

Given the strong global calls for solutions and progress in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation, we have an obligation to seek results, and not simply produce policy statements along known lines. Seen together with the paralyzed state of the Conference of Disarmament, which has equally failed to make a substantial contribution for more than a decade, the state of the disarmament machinery is disheartening.

Our lack of results would perhaps be more understandable were it not for the fact that there have been significant developments in the world outside this room and that they have immediate relevance for our deliberations.

With regard to nuclear disarmament, the outcome document (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol. I)) of last year's Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) should provide our discussion with new oxygen. The entry into force of the New START treaty has shown that the reduction of existing arsenals is a living process. As noted in a recent article by some former senior United States politicians, nuclear deterrence is becoming increasingly hazardous and decreasingly effective. Continuing reliance upon it, they say, encourages or at least excuses the spread of nuclear weapons. Deeper reductions, including of tactical nuclear weapons, are therefore necessary. This would increase stability and security.

Yet there have also been negative developments that merit our consideration. The pillars of the NPT are mutually reinforcing. The increasing and unpredictable proliferation of nuclear technology for purposes other than peaceful uses is one of the most serious security

issues of our time. Some countries are defying NPT obligations, in one case even conducting nuclear tests, and are refusing to cooperate fully with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) or to allow the IAEA to verify that their nuclear programmes are of a peaceful nature. This is of deep and continuing concern.

The peaceful use of nuclear energy is the third pillar of the NPT. Sweden is a strong supporter of multilateral nuclear fuel approaches and the ongoing work to establish a nuclear fuel bank under the control of the IAEA. As a member of the IAEA Board of Governors as of autumn 2011, Sweden will contribute both to this work and to the Agency's important work in preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

It is encouraging that the discussion of a global zero vision, whereby we would eventually reach a world free of nuclear weapons, has been revitalized. To get there, we need to avail ourselves of what we — being Scandinavian — could illustratively call a "Lego" approach, with mutually supporting building blocks. These include a verifiable fissile material cut-off treaty, which we believe is within reach, alongside the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, the IAEA and its safeguards, deeper reductions, nuclear weapon free zones and other confidence-building measures. We applaud, in this context, the Secretary-General's engagement in revitalizing the Conference on Disarmament and the High-level Meeting of the General Assembly conducted last year. We look forward to its follow-up.

Sweden attaches great importance to strengthened control of transfers of conventional weapons, which through their unregulated and illicit spread in volatile regions are a serious threat to international security. We believe that the Disarmament Commission should carefully consider recommendations for continued work on this topic. Not least, the processes towards next year's United Nations Conference on an Arms Trade Treaty and the review conference on the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects should provide us with plenty of food for thought.

In conclusion, we hope that this year, as the Disarmament Commission comes to the end of its three-year cycle, we will have some results to show for our efforts, though we fear that yet again we might not. Meeting the General Assembly's request to agree on recommendations on elements for a declaration of a fourth disarmament decade would be a minimum. Making progress on the other two topics should be an imperative. Let us use these three weeks — a not insignificant period of time in today's world — in a way that will help this Commission regain some of its relevance.

Mr. Sin Son Ho (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): Allow me, first of all, on behalf of the delegation of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as Chairman of the Disarmament Commission. I sincerely wish you success in chairing this session. My delegation also fully supports the statement delivered by the Indonesian delegation on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Despite decades-long strenuous efforts of the international community for nuclear disarmament, the total elimination of nuclear weapons, which is the desire of humankind, remains of the highest priority due to certain specific countries' pursuit of their ambitions to wield world hegemony based on nuclear-weapon superiority. It is very clear that, as long as nuclear weapons exist in our globe and their use or threat of use continues, humankind will never be free of the danger of nuclear war and nuclear non-proliferation will never be brought to a fundamental solution.

As all of us are well aware, it is the United States that first developed and, without hesitation, used nuclear weapons in actual warfare in 1945. This, in turn, led several countries one after another to make the choice to possess nuclear weapons. The present United States administration is loudly talking about a nuclear-weapon-free world. However, its policy to monopolize nuclear weapons remains unchanged. Even today, the United States is stepping up the modernization of its nuclear weapons by conducting critical testing and spending a large amount of money under the pretext of securing the stability of its nuclear arsenal. On the other hand, the United States continues to maintain its huge nuclear forces deployed in areas of strategic importance around the world, and to rely on its nuclear doctrine as usual. Some countries are designated by the United States as targets of potential pre-emptive nuclear strikes because of their disobedience to the United States, and the substantial

nuclear threat against them are daily increasing. Those phenomena should no longer be overlooked.

The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), during the past 40 years, has played no role either in nuclear disarmament or in the elimination of nuclear threats, contrary to the high expectations of non-nuclear-weapon States. Rather, the nuclear Powers are now in a better position and their exclusive status is more justified. Furthermore, the NPT has been misused by certain countries as an instrument to pressure and interfere in the developing countries.

Therefore, the States members of the Non-aligned Movement have set the total elimination of nuclear weapons as an ultimate objective and submitted constructive and concrete proposals to this body to realize their goals. When the States with the largest nuclear arsenals, such as the United States, take the lead in nuclear disarmament, that will have a positive influence on the newly emerged nuclear-weapon States in various parts of the world and contribute to the total elimination of nuclear weapons from the planet.

My delegation takes this opportunity to draw attention to the issues of when and by whom nuclear weapons were deployed for the first time on the Korean peninsula; by whom the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is being blackmailed with nuclear weapons; and what is the true nature of the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula.

As is already well known, the ongoing nuclear threats of the United States against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea started since 1950, very soon after nuclear weapons appear in the world. The United States began to blackmail the Democratic People's Republic of Korea with nuclear weapons during the Korean War, from 1950 to 1953. Beginning in 1957, the United States brought nuclear weapons into South Korea. In the first decade of this century, the United States also designated the Democratic People's Republic of Korea as a part of an "axis of evil" and a potential target of pre-emptive nuclear strike.

Furthermore, the present United States Administration excluded the Democratic People's Republic of Korea from the list of negative security assurances in its Nuclear Posture Review, announced in April 2010, while driving the situation of the Korean peninsula to the brink of nuclear war.

Last year, the United States did not even hesitate to dispatch the nuclear-powered aircraft carrier *USS George Washington* to the sensitive West Sea of Korea; this year, from late February to now, it has conducted reckless joint military exercises with South Korea under the code names "Key Resolve" and "Foal Eagle", mobilizing all kinds of vectors for pre-emptive nuclear strikes. Today, the nuclear threats of the United States against the Korean nation are not a notional concept but an actual reality. This is the reason why the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is compelled to possess its own nuclear deterrence for the purpose of safeguarding the supreme interests and security of the nation and State, and of preventing a nuclear war on the Korean peninsula.

In a word, the nuclear issue on the Korean peninsula has been created by the United States, which first introduced nuclear weapons into South Korea and has threatened the Democratic People's Republic of Korea with nuclear weapons for more than half a century. Likewise, the nuclear confrontation on the Korean peninsula is in essence a Democratic People's Republic of Korea-United States confrontation.

The military strikes now being undertaken by the United States and its coalition forces against Libya teach the international community a serious lesson. This military intervention shows that the Libyan model of nuclear disarmament — much talked about by the United States in the past — was an aggressive method of coaxing Libya with such sugar-coated words as "guarantee" and "improvement of relations" in order to disarm and then swallow it by force. It proves once again that peace can be preserved only when any State or nation can have its own strength while high-handed and arbitrary practices are openly practiced in today's world.

It is a consistent position of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to maintain peace and stability and realize the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula through dialogue and negotiation. Any attempt by the United States to force the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to abandon nuclear weapons is nothing but a daydream. The more the United States enforces its hostile policy against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the more the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will strengthen its nuclear deterrence.

If the United States has any real concern for peace and security on the Korean peninsula, it should abandon its anachronistic hostile policy towards Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea is fully committed to discharging its international obligations as a responsible nuclear-weapon State.

Mr. Bravaco (United States of America): The United States congratulates the Republic of Iraq on its election to the chairmanship of the 2011 session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission. Mr. Chairman, we wish you well and pledge our full support as you ably guide the work of the Commission forward. We also thank the other members of the Bureau for their willingness to serve, as well as High Representative Duarte for his support for the Commission, and we offer a special note of appreciation to the Republic of Benin's Permanent Representative, Ambassador Jean-Francis Zinsou, who personally has laboured over many years to seek a successful outcome to the Commission's objectives.

This year, the Disarmament Commission is faced with a great deal of work to complete and very little time in which to complete that work. Fortunately, the task before us emerges against the backdrop of renewed international action, progress and achievement in the arms control, non-proliferation and disarmament arenas.

For it was two years ago tomorrow, on 5 April 2009, that President Barack Obama addressed the people of the beautiful city of Prague, and the people of the world, and recalled another momentous spring in the long struggle for human freedom everywhere. In his address, and most pertinently to the work on which this Commission is about to embark, the President stated clearly and with conviction America's commitment to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons. He outlined a series of steps, initiatives and actions that America would take in the coming years to reinvigorate my country's responsibility to contribute to this historic effort. The President acknowledged that the steps he laid out — strengthening the global nuclear non-proliferation regime, reducing the numbers of nuclear warheads and their role in military strategy, preventing access to nuclear materials by terrorists, and expanding peaceful nuclear cooperation as the right of every nation that renounces nuclear weapons and plays by the rules — would not be easy to achieve. The President said specifically:

> "Now, I know that there are some who will question whether we can act on such a broad agenda. There are those who doubt whether true international cooperation is possible, given inevitable differences among nations. And there are those who hear talk of a world without nuclear weapons and doubt whether it is worth setting a goal that seems impossible to achieve."

Well, in the past two years, the international community has risen to the occasion and taken significant steps in delivering on the promise of a safer world. As one reflects on this period of progress in arms control, non-proliferation and peaceful uses of nuclear technology, it is fair to say that the President's speech in Prague helped to set the tone for a number of subsequent advances in these areas. Specific examples of the success that can be achieved when nations commit to doing their part and working together include the April 2010 groundbreaking Nuclear Security Summit, the United States Nuclear Posture Review, the United States Administration's stated intent to transmit to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification of the Protocols to the African and South Pacific nuclear-weapon-free zone treaties, the successful Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons in May 2010, and most recently, the 5 February 2011 entry into force of the New START treaty between the United States and the Russian Federation.

Certainly, there is much more yet to achieve, including bringing into force the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and starting negotiations on a verifiable fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT). In this regard, we are deeply disappointed with the failure of the Conference on Disarmament to take up an FMCT — a failure that casts a shadow over our deliberations here in New York. Nonetheless, at home and in partnership with Governments around the world, the United States will continue working to make these vital multilateral instruments a reality. They are so very long overdue.

As this year's session of the Disarmament Commission begins, let me state clearly that America intends to be as flexible as possible on procedural matters, as well as substantive outcomes. We have come here to do business, achieve results and

foreswear gamesmanship. Accordingly, we supported the establishment of another subsidiary body to address three issues this session: "Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons" in Working Group 1; "Elements of a draft declaration of the 2010s as the fourth disarmament decade" in Working Group 2; and "Practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons" in Working Group 3.

I would like to recall General Assembly decision 52/492 of 1998, which states among other things that "parallel meetings of [the Commission's] subsidiary bodies should be avoided." In this context, the revised general programme of work approved by the Commission this morning appears to us to take account of this concern; the plan is fair and makes the most of the time available.

Regarding substantive matters, we look forward to receiving as soon as possible the documents which the three Working Group Chairs intend to use as the basis for achieving consensus. My capital, like all others no doubt, will require time to digest Working Group proposals and issue specific guidance, so I respectfully appeal for such information to be provided as soon as possible.

As I mentioned earlier, we have but three weeks left in this issue cycle to conclude our work. My delegation therefore recommends that we distil from previous efforts only the most broadly agreed, realistic and focused approaches that have the best chance of commanding consensus on agreed principles, guidelines, recommendations and/or elements. I readily admit that this is easier to achieve in theory than in practice; if it were not, the Commission would have done so years ago. But we must keep trying. Simply put, we have but two options before us: within the limited time available, to commit to registering some progress, however modest; or alternatively to end the Disarmament Commission's second three-year issue cycle in a row with no result whatsoever.

As always, America will do its part to achieve a positive outcome in this, the international community's deliberative think tank on arms control, non-proliferation and disarmament issues. We look forward to working with all delegations as together we pursue this goal.

Mr. Šćepanović (Montenegro): At the outset, allow me to congratulate you, Sir, and the other members of the Bureau on your election, and to assure you of the full support and cooperation of the Montenegrin delegation. We believe that, under your able leadership, this year's session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission will have a successful outcome.

Montenegro recognizes the significance and important role of the Disarmament Commission as a deliberative multilateral body with universal membership that serves as a forum for thorough discussions and considerations of specific disarmament issues. In that light, we extend our support to the work of the Working Groups and look forward to achieving tangible results and a fruitful conclusion of our three-year cycle.

Montenegro fully aligns itself with the statement made by the representative of Hungary on behalf of the European Union.

Montenegro warmly welcomes the latest developments and substantial progress made in the fields of disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation, such as the entry into force of the New START treaty, the successful conclusion of the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the adoption by consensus of an action plan, the entry into force of the Convention on Cluster Munitions, negotiations under way on an arms trade treaty, and so on.

In particular, Montenegro remains firmly committed to the prevention of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and consequently to the implementation of the provisions of the NPT, a key treaty of the global nuclear non-proliferation regime, and all of its related action plans, as well as to the relevant Security Council resolutions. Montenegro supports the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty as an integral part of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, and welcomes the recent positive progress made in that regard.

As for the Conference on Disarmament, we call for immediate commencement of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty, based on the 1995 Shannon mandate. We cannot afford further delays and must stay engaged in order to find a sustainable solution to overcome the deadlock. We commend the initiative of the Secretary-General to convene a High-

level Meeting in September 2010 on this matter, and fully support the recommendations and follow-up steps to revitalize the work of the Conference on Disarmament.

Montenegro attaches great importance to the issue of conventional weapons. My country is devoted to the full implementation of the United Nations Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, and sees the Open-ended Meeting of Governmental Experts to be held in May as an opportunity to enhance its implementation. Montenegro strongly supports the negotiations under way on a comprehensive, legally-binding arms trade treaty, which we believe at its core should set high standards and norms for the transfer of conventional weapons. We welcome the positive results of the two sessions of the Preparatory Committee held so far.

Montenegro welcomes the adoption of the Vientiane Action Plan 2010-2015 at the first Meeting of the States Parties to the Convention on Cluster Munitions in the Lao People's Democratic Republic in November 2010. Allow me to reiterate that my country was among first 30 States to sign and ratify the Convention on Cluster Munitions, thereby making it possible for it to enter into force. I would also like to underscore that last year Montenegro successfully concluded the process of destroying its entire cluster munition stockpile, well ahead of the Convention's specified timeline. This serves as one more proof of Montenegro's strong dedication to playing an active role and contributing in a practical way to multilateral efforts implement the treaty comprehensively and effectively.

The Montenegrin delegation looks forward to engaging in this year's session of the Disarmament Commission and is open to constructive cooperation. I would like to assure you, Mr. Chairman, of our support for your efforts towards an effective organization of our forthcoming work and the achievement of tangible results.

Mr. Zhang Junan (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): At the outset, the Chinese delegation would like to congratulate you, Sir, on your election to the chairmanship of this session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, and to assure you of its full cooperation. My delegation also takes this opportunity to express appreciations to your predecessor, Ambassador Jean-Francis Zinsou of Benin, for his outstanding work.

The first decade of the twenty-first century has witnessed complex and profound evolutions of the international security landscape. With traditional and non-traditional security threats interweaving and global challenges and regional hotspots closely interacting, the interdependence among States has never been as strong as it is today. This new security situation calls on us to embrace a new security concept centred on mutual trust, mutual benefit, equality and coordination, and to pursue security through cooperation. Only by doing so can we effectively advance the international arms control and disarmament cause and attain the goal of common security and peaceful development shared by all.

This year is to conclude the current deliberation cycle of the Disarmament Commission. During the past three years, a series of positive developments in the international arms control and disarmament arena has been encouraging. The international nuclear process is facing important opportunities, while the vision of a world free of nuclear weapons is gaining wider recognition. The Disarmament Commission can and must reflect these developments. At past sessions, the Commission has held in-depth discussions on relevant agenda items and enhanced mutual understanding thereof. It is the earnest hope of the Chinese delegation that all delegations will cherish the existing working basis, show full flexibility and try their best to achieve positive outcomes from this session so as to do our part in strengthening the status and role of the Disarmament Commission.

It is the common aspiration of the international community to completely prohibit and thoroughly destroy nuclear weapons, and to realize a world free of such weapons. If we are to create a safer world for all, we must first and foremost remove the threat of nuclear war. In this connection, the Chinese delegation holds that nuclear-weapon States should fulfil in good faith their nuclear disarmament obligations, as stipulated in article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), reduce the role of nuclear weapons in their national security policies, and unequivocally undertake not to seek permanent possession of nuclear weapons.

Nuclear-weapon States should unequivocally undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons,

not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States and nuclear-weapon-free zones, and commit themselves to concluding an international legal instrument in this regard at an early date. The international community should make concerted efforts to bring forward the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty at an early date, and the early start of negotiations on the fissile material cut-off treaty within the framework of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva.

China appreciates the positive outcomes of the Eighth NPT Review Conference. We also attach great importance to the signing and entry into force of the bilateral nuclear disarmament treaty between the United States and the Russian Federation. We are of the view that countries with the largest nuclear arsenals bear special and primary responsibility for nuclear disarmament, and should continue to make drastic and substantive reductions in their nuclear arsenals. When conditions are ripe, other nuclear-weapon States should also join the multilateral negotiations on nuclear disarmament. To attain the ultimate goal of complete and comprehensive nuclear disarmament, the international community should develop, at an appropriate time, a viable long-term plan, comprising phased actions, including the conclusion of a convention on the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons.

Effectively preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons is an essential condition for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. From a broader perspective, it is also a precondition for the maintenance of global and regional peace and security. In addressing the complex and volatile situation of nuclear non-proliferation, the international community should direct efforts towards the following aspects.

First, with a view to addressing the root causes of proliferation, a peaceful and stable international security environment with mutual trust and cooperation should be fostered so as to remove motives for the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Secondly, non-proliferation hot-spot issues should be resolved through political and diplomatic means. On regional nuclear issues, peaceful settlement through dialogue and negotiations is the fundamental way forward.

Thirdly, the international nuclear non-proliferation regime should be consolidated. The universality, authority and effectiveness of the NPT should be further enhanced, and the safeguards function of the International Atomic Energy Agency should be strengthened.

Fourthly, the legitimate right of each State to the peaceful use of nuclear energy should be respected, and the impartiality and non-discriminatory nature of international efforts on nuclear non-proliferation should be ensured. Meanwhile, the practice of abuse and double standards should be discarded.

Fifthly, nuclear security levels should be raised globally and nuclear risks should be reduced. Effective measures should be taken to ensure the safety of nuclear facilities and materials to prevent the diversion of such materials. All countries should strengthen cooperation on combating nuclear terrorism.

China has always actively supported and participated in international non-proliferation efforts, and has strictly fulfilled its obligations. We have always called for the peaceful resolution of the Korean peninsula and Iranian nuclear issues through dialogue and negotiations, and have made constant efforts to that end.

The declaration of the 2010s as the fourth disarmament decade is of great significance to the promotion of the international arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation process. China is of the view that the declaration of the fourth disarmament decade should be in line with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and the guiding principles enshrined in the Final Document (resolution S-10/2) of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Furthermore, the declaration should take into consideration the new characteristics of the current international security situation and specify, in a comprehensive and balanced way, the main tasks and priorities of international arms control and non-proliferation this decade.

During the previous session of the Disarmament Commission, we held valuable discussions on the elements of a draft declaration of the 2010s as the fourth disarmament decade, and achieved much common understanding. We hope that all parties can strengthen their efforts, respect and accommodate each

other's concerns, show flexibility and strive to reach an agreement on the elements of the declaration at an early date.

China supports confidence-building measures (CBMs) in the field of conventional weapons. We welcome revisiting that agenda item in the Disarmament Commission. China has always been and will remain a staunch force in safeguarding international and regional peace and stability. For many years, at the bilateral level and in multilateral frameworks, such as the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, the Regional Forum of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and the Conference on Interaction and Confidence-building Measures in Asia, China has worked with the relevant countries to vigorously explore and practice CBMs with a view to enhancing mutual trust and promoting regional security. China also participated in the United Nations Standardized Instrument for Reporting Military Expenditures and the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

Looking towards the second decade of the twenty-first century, we are confident about the future of the international arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation cause. China is ready to join hands with all other countries in renewing our contributions to building a harmonious world, with lasting peace and common prosperity.

Mr. Shin Dong-ik (Republic of Korea): At the outset, I wish to join previous speakers in congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the Chair of the Disarmament Commission at its 2011 substantive session. I would also like to congratulate the other members of the Bureau on their elections. I am sure that your able stewardship will guide us through these three-weeks of deliberations.

During the past few years, the international community has witnessed multiple positive steps in the field of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Those include a Security Council summit (see S/PV.6191) on nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament, followed by its adoption of resolution 1887 (2009), the signing and ratification of the New START between the two largest nuclear Powers, and, finally, the adoption, after a decade, of the Final Document (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol. I)) by consensus at the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

The adoption of the Final Document at the Eighth NPT Review Conference in particular amounts to formal recognition by the international community of the fact that disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons has resurfaced once again as a keystone of the global agenda and that the responsibility to achieve the common goal of a nuclear-free world rests on the shoulders of both nuclear States and non-nuclear States alike.

As we gather here today against that backdrop, we must not simply complacently look back at what we have achieved, but instead drive ourselves forward to take the next steps. Indeed, I hope that this year's deliberations at the Disarmament Commission, now in the final stage of a three-year cycle, will be able to facilitate global efforts on disarmament and non-proliferation, while simultaneously laying a sound foundation to further our common goal of a world free of nuclear weapons.

This year, we also need to give more attention to the agenda item on practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons. As the Commission was unable to take up the agenda item in the past two years, it is important that there is constructive deliberation on the issue during this session.

Considering the past decade of stalemate in the field of disarmament, it is clear that the international community in general, and not only the disarmament community, needs and expects some long-awaited progress. My delegation hopes that our deliberation on the issue of declaring the 2010s as the next disarmament decade will proceed in a practical and efficient manner so that we can agree upon the text expeditiously. In that regard, I look forward to engaging in meaningful discussions in the following three areas during this session.

First, over the past decade there have been increasing concerns regarding the effectiveness of the Conference on Disarmament. That is why the Secretary-General convened the High-level Meeting on Revitalizing the Work of the Conference on Disarmament and Taking Forward Multilateral Disarmament Negotiations in September 2010. If the Conference remains mired in deadlock, its status and legitimacy as the premier forum for disarmament will be jeopardized. I firmly believe that the Conference should act quickly if it wants to keep playing its central

role. We call upon all Conference members to cooperate on commencing substantive work on a fissile material cut-off treaty at the earliest possible time, not only for nuclear non-proliferation but also for nuclear disarmament.

Secondly, the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) is another task on which we must take decisive action. The prospects for the early entry into force of the CTBT are brighter than ever. We must seize the opportunity for action created by the current circumstances. The Republic of Korea calls upon those States that have not yet ratified the Treaty, in particular the remaining nine annex 2 States, to do so immediately. We also stress the importance of maintaining a moratorium on nuclear testing until the entry into force of the CTBT.

Thirdly, along with the ongoing efforts to achieve the universality of the NPT, my delegation believes that the monitoring and verification mechanisms of the Treaty need to be strengthened even further through the universalization of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) additional protocol. In particular, the Final Document of the Eighth NPT Review Conference could breathe new life into the NPT. In that regard, the Government of the Republic of Korea reaffirms its commitment to fully implementing the conclusions and recommendations for follow-on actions adopted at the 2010 NPT Review Conference.

Let me now draw the Commission's attention to the most pressing issue confronting us. International efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear-weapon programmes remain seriously hampered by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. In particular, the country's revelation regarding its uranium enrichment programme last November has opened a new and disturbing chapter in the North Korean nuclear issue, further complicating our task of realizing complete and verifiable denuclearization. Without a doubt, North Korea's uranium enrichment programme clearly violates the relevant Security Council resolutions and is contrary to its commitments under the 2005 Joint Statement of the Fourth Round of the Six-Party Talks.

Despite that blatant act of non-compliance, we are continuing our efforts to revitalize dialogue in an effort to keep moving forward, not backwards, in the denuclearization process. We are ready to engage the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in such a dialogue once we are certain of its readiness to end its nuclear ambitions and programmes once and for all.

For the time being, however, in the light of the seriousness of the uranium enrichment programme of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, we believe that the international community should send that country a clear, unambiguous message that continuing defiance of its international obligations will not be rewarded and will serve only to deepen its isolation. The absence of appropriate actions against such provocations as the uranium enrichment programme would only lead the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to mistakenly believe that the international community is unwilling and unable to address its persistent pursuit of nuclear development.

In that regard, the international community must strongly condemn North Korea's clear violation of Security Council resolutions 1718 (2006) and 1874 (2009) and urge it to fully comply with other relevant Council resolutions, especially by abandoning all of its nuclear programmes, including its uranium enrichment programme, in a complete, verifiable and irreversible manner.

A new consensus now seems to be forming in the international community, not only towards nuclear non-proliferation but also regarding the eventual goal of a nuclear-free world. Having witnessed some meaningful signs, we need to redouble our efforts to ensure that they produce tangible results. We must work hard and make bold decisions in laying the foundation for lasting progress. My delegation once again stresses our shared sense of responsibility and willingness to cooperate to ensure the success of the upcoming deliberations and beyond.

The Chair: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply. In that connection, I would like to remind delegations that the number of interventions in exercise of the right of reply for any delegation on any item at a given meeting is limited to two. The first intervention should be limited to 10 minutes, and the second to five minutes.

Mr. Yun Yong Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): I would like to exercise my right of reply in response to the statement made by the representative of the Republic of Korea.

The uranium enrichment programme of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is purely of a peaceful nature and is intended to produce fuel for light-water reactors to pave the way for meeting the ever-growing domestic need for electricity. In other words, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is exercising the right of all countries to the peaceful use of nuclear energy. Many countries are currently exercising that right for the purposes of their economic development. Similarly, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's uranium enrichment programme is fully in line with the international trend of development and international law.

I would like to clarify that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not recognize, and completely rejects, Security Council resolutions 1718 (2006) and 1874 (2009).

Mr. Rim Kap-soo (Republic of Korea): I have requested the floor in exercise of the right of reply to the statements made by the representative of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea's.

First of all, our understanding is that the right to the peaceful use of nuclear energy is granted to States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) that faithfully adhere to non-proliferation regulations and norms. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea announced its unilateral withdrawal from the NPT in 2003 and conducted nuclear-weapon testing in 2006 and 2009. Accordingly, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea should not claim any right to the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

In addition, Security Council resolutions 1718 (2006) and 1874 (2009) clearly demand that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea abandon all nuclear weapons and existing nuclear programmes — and I stress, all existing nuclear programmes, irrespective of their nature — in a complete, verifiable and irreversible manner.

Mr. Yun Yong Il (Democratic People's Republic of Korea): The Democratic People's Republic of Korea acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in the hope of realizing the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula. However, the NPT was unable to prevent the deployment of nuclear weapons in South Korea and the nuclear threats of the United States against my country.

Furthermore, the NPT was misused by the United States as an instrument to exert pressure on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, which is why my country withdrew from the NPT. As long as nuclear weapons exist in the world and their use and threat of use, high-handedness and military intervention continue, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea will never rejoin the NPT.

The South Korean delegation just said that no country outside the NPT should have the right to peacefully use nuclear energy. Despite the South Korean delegation's claim, however, countries outside the NPT also have that right. That is the current situation in the world.

I would like to take this opportunity to call for the delegation of the Republic of Korea not to collaborate or stand with the United States, which is pursuing its ambition to control North-East Asia as a whole, bearing in mind that reliance on foreign forces is a self-destructive move that will have catastrophic results for the Korean nation.

The Republic of Korea should implement the North-South Joint Declaration of 15 June 2000 and the Joint Statement of 3 October 2007, signed by our respective leaders in Pyongyang. That is the only way to realize the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula.

Mr. Rim Kap-soo (Republic of Korea): My delegation does not want to consume further time and energy in repeating the clear and unequivocal position expressed by the international community on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea nuclear issue and other provocations.

My delegation would like to draw members' attention to a few documents — namely, Security Council resolutions 1718 (2006) and 1874 (2009), the Final Document of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol. I)) and the International Atomic Energy Agency resolution of September 2010 on Democratic People's Republic of Korea issues — which clearly reaffirm that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea cannot, in any case, have the status of a nuclear-weapon State.

The 2010 NPT Final Document also states that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has to fulfil its commitment under the 2005 Joint Statement of the Fourth Round of the Six-Party Talks and its

obligations under Security Council resolution 1718 (2006) and 1874 (2009), which clearly demand that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea abandon all nuclear weapons and existing nuclear programmes in a complete, verifiable and irreversible manner.

I would like to advise my colleagues from the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to take a look at the numerous resolutions and documents adopted by the international community.

The meeting rose at 4.35 p.m.

United Nations A/CN.10/PV.312

General Assembly Official Records

Disarmament Commission
312th meeting
Tuesday, 5 April 2011, 10 a.m.
New York

Chair: Mr. Al Bayati ..... (Iraq)

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

General debate (*continued*)

Mr. Farghal (Egypt) (*spoke in Arabic*): The delegation of Egypt is pleased to congratulate you, Sir, on your election as Chair of the current session of the United Nations Disarmament Commission, as well as the members of the Bureau. We are confident that your wisdom and experience will guide the current session towards achieving the desired outcome, given your country's role as an active member of the Non-Aligned Movement, the Group of Arab States and the Group of Asian States.

The delegation of Egypt aligns itself with the statements delivered by the Permanent Representative of Indonesia, on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement, and the representative of Nigeria, on behalf of the African Group.

The successful conclusion of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) serves as a good basis on which we can build so as to revitalize international disarmament efforts within the framework of the United Nations. Furthermore, we note a number of other positive developments, such as the ratification of the New START agreement by the United States and the Russian Federation, the high-level meeting on strengthening international disarmament mechanisms convened by the Secretary-General last September, and other relevant advances that have helped to improve the environment for negotiations on United Nations disarmament mechanisms.

Despite such positive developments, the international community continues to witness increasing challenges in regional and international security and stability that threaten the credibility of existing international treaties and agreements. The most serious of those is some States either evading their obligations or failing to implement their commitments under false pretences. Such challenges must be addressed with the necessary urgency.

Egypt is therefore increasingly concerned about the continuing stagnation of the current international environment in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation at the international and regional levels, in particular with regard to the international community's respect for the priority of its basic terms of reference under international treaties, United Nations resolutions and decisions of the relevant international forums. Although the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament identified the goal of nuclear disarmament as the key priority for international efforts in the field of disarmament and arms control, the world is still witnessing setbacks in the process of achieving nuclear disarmament, non-proliferation and the universality of the NPT, the cornerstone of the global disarmament and non-proliferation regime.

With regard to nuclear disarmament, the multilateral efforts of the five nuclear-weapon States remain extremely limited, in particular in relation to

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

Please recycle

the commitments made by those States under the Non-Proliferation Treaty. In the area of non-proliferation, regrettably, we are seeing efforts to prioritize non-proliferation in the absence of parallel progress in nuclear disarmament, under the assumption of some illusory linkage between the achievement of non-proliferation and the imposition of limitations on the benefits available to non-nuclear-weapon States as a result of their inalienable right to the peaceful use of nuclear energy. That represents a challenge in the context of the principles of the NPT and the role of the International Atomic Energy Agency with regard to nuclear verification.

Furthermore, to date no progress has been made in the practical implementation of the action plan on the Middle East adopted by the 2010 NPT Review Conference, in particular on mandating the Secretary-General and the three depositary States of the NPT, in consultation with the States of the region, to convene a conference in 2012 on the establishment in the region of a zone free of nuclear weapons as well as other weapons of mass destruction. It is thus cause for concern that to date a facilitator has not been chosen and the venue of the conference has not been determined. In that regard, the delegation of Egypt calls for the finalization, as soon as possible, of the aforementioned procedural measures so as to enable a facilitator to be appointed to immediately begin the necessary substantive consultations with concerned States so that the conference can be convened within the agreed time frame and its success facilitated.

To meet those challenges, the delegation of Egypt looks forward to actively participating in the deliberations of Working Group I on "Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons", Working Group II on "Elements of a draft declaration of the 2010s as the fourth disarmament decade", and Working Group III, which will discuss the topic "Practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons".

Egypt stresses the need for the efforts of Working Group I during this session of the Commission to be geared to achieving an outcome that promotes the implementation of General Assembly resolutions on nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation and the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, including the two resolutions submitted by Egypt that were adopted by the General Assembly during this session, namely, resolution 65/42, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East", and resolution 65/88, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East".

The results of the current session of the Disarmament Commission must also strengthen the plan of action adopted at the 2010 NPT Review Conference to convene a conference in 2012 on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons as well as of other weapons of mass destruction, in implementation of the 1995 resolution on the Middle East.

The Working Group should issue concrete recommendations aimed at ensuring that the credibility of the international non-proliferation regime is not eroded as a result of nuclear-weapon States not implementing their obligations in accordance with the consensus on which the NPT was built, represented in the nuclear-weapon States' destruction of their nuclear arsenals in return for a commitment by non-nuclear-weapon States to refrain from seeking to acquire such weapons.

These deficiencies in implementation hamper the effectiveness of the non-proliferation efforts and contribute to obstructing efforts to achieve the universality of the treaty, bringing its credibility into question.

It is known to all that strengthening the international disarmament agenda does not depend only on the implementation of existing commitments but requires the revitalization of the Conference on Disarmament and the highlighting of the importance of that forum as the sole multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament.

In the context of revitalizing the role of the Conference on Disarmament, we must recognize that many of the central objectives in the field of disarmament can be achieved at the international level only through negotiations within the Conference, such as negotiations on a nuclear-weapons convention aimed at a total ban on nuclear weapons, with the year 2025 as the appropriate time frame for the realization of a nuclear-weapon-free world through such negotiations, and negotiations on crafting a legally binding international instrument that provides non-nuclear-weapon States with unconditional assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, pending the realization of nuclear disarmament.

Our delegation believes that it is particularly important to include as an element of the fourth disarmament decade the imperative need to convene the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. We must also emphasize the importance of holding the organizational session of the Open-ended Working Group at the earliest in order to set a date for its substantive sessions in 2011 and 2012, which will include the establishment of the Preparatory Committee for the fourth special session, on the theme of confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons.

We must focus on the pivotal importance of the existing structures of the United Nations, including in particular the framework represented by the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, as a politically binding instrument which deals with the illicit trade in such arms.

Furthermore, any discussion on the issue of conventional weapons must recognize all the relevant principles of the Charter, especially the right of States to manufacture, import and retain conventional arms for purposes of their legitimate self-defence. I wish to refer here to the ongoing discussions concerning the proposed Arms Trade Treaty, a conference on which will take place in 2012. I wish to point out that the second session of the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty, which was held only a few weeks ago, demonstrated the need to observe the consensus rule, as well as the importance of reflecting the views of all States in an objective, balanced, fair and transparent manner. This is essential if there is to be a genuine desire to reach a universal, fair and balanced treaty that focuses on saving lives, rather than remaining limited for the purpose of the reallocation of shares in international sales of conventional arms and the granting of exceptional political and commercial benefits for major arms-exporting countries.

In conclusion, I would like to assure you, Sir, that the delegation of Egypt will cooperate with you, Bureau members and all delegations in the process of reaching a successful outcome of the work of the Commission, in order to achieve all of the lofty objectives related to disarmament issues on the agenda of the Commission this year.

Mr. Rai (Nepal): I wish to begin, Sir, by congratulating you on your election as Chair as well as other members of the Bureau on their election. I am fully confident that your able leadership will guide the Commission's deliberations towards a tangible conclusion.

I wish to thank Mr. Sergio Duarte, High Representative of the Secretary-General for Disarmament Affairs, for his succinct presentation.

I align my statement with the statement made by Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

The Disarmament Commission has been serving as a deliberative body, with the function of making recommendations and ensuring follow-up with respect to various issues in the field of disarmament. Since its establishment in 1978 by the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, the Commission has succeeded in delivering many concrete results by formulating consensus principles, guidelines and recommendations in a number of areas in the field of disarmament, including guidelines for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones. This tradition of achieving concrete results must continue. The Commission must be fully utilized as a platform for sincerely pursuing the shared goal of disarmament.

My delegation is confident that this time, all three Working Groups of the current substantive session will produce concrete results with regard to their respective agendas.

Following the convening of the International Conference on the Relationship between Disarmament and Development in 1987, our collective call is to reserve our precious yet limited resources for the well-being of human beings, instead of producing and procuring devastating armaments. It is never too late to act for the maintenance of international peace and security, with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources, as envisioned in Article 26 of the Charter of the United Nations.

The relationship between disarmament and development is complex but undeniable. The notion of security goes beyond the traditional narrow concept of military security. In today's world, more than at any time in the past, it encompasses political, economic, social, humanitarian, human rights and environmental aspects. Security remains elusive in this volatile world, where multiple crises affect disproportionately the poor

and vulnerable, who are already frustrated at the prevailing levels of inequality, poverty, hunger and disease. Ever-growing military expenditures are a clear example of the unsavory fact of the diversion of financial, technological and human resources for destructive purposes. This is the case at a time when global poverty eradication and development goals are not being met owing to a lack of funds.

Nearly seven decades after the first use of atomic bombs, which inflicted untold sorrow, that is still a mainstay of national security policy for a number of States. However, the threat to international peace and security persists unabated. Even after the indefinite extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) regime, in 1995, the world has not yet witnessed significant actions towards nuclear disarmament.

We are waiting for the remaining annex 2 countries that have not yet done so to ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.

My delegation notes with satisfaction that the 64-point action plan concluded by the 2010 NPT Review Conference encompasses all three of the Treaty's pillars. The implementation of that plan would lead us towards the desired goal of disarmament and non-proliferation.

We believe that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones by various treaties helps to promote non-proliferation in the respective regions. It is inspiring to note that currently more than 110 countries belong to legally binding nuclear-weapon-free zones.

We also appreciate the recent entry into force of the 10-year New START agreement between the Russian Federation and the United States of America. It is imperative that the nuclear-weapon States that hold the majority of the world's nuclear weapons set forth bold decisions for disarmament.

Small arms and light weapons have caused devastating effects on many developing countries, particularly on conflict-ridden countries. The myriad numbers of small arms and light weapons require our urgent action to prevent their possible diversion to non-authorized recipients, including non-State actors. We emphasize that the effective implementation of the 2001 United Nations Programme of Action on Small Arms and Light Weapons would help to curb this problem.

While we appreciate the various initiatives that like-minded countries have presented in the field of disarmament, my delegation places special emphasis on the immediate revival of the Conference on Disarmament as a multilateral disarmament negotiation forum. Member States have to work harder to start negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty in an earnest manner. Nepal is of the view that the early convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, with the broader participation of Member States, would help unblock the deadlock in the disarmament machinery and processes in a comprehensive way.

As the host to the United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific, Nepal attaches great importance to multilateral negotiations in disarmament and non-proliferation. This approach promotes collective deliberations, responsibility and ownership by all for collective global action. Regional organizations could also play an important role in strengthening confidence-building measures.

In conclusion, if global peace, security and prosperity are our shared objectives, we must redouble our efforts to ensure the universal application of the instruments we have developed. The effective implementation of our past commitments will be crucial to consolidating further progress in the field of disarmament. We should also shoulder our responsibility to make the Disarmament Commission a consensus-generating body. We should all strive to make disarmament a reality through our resolute collective action.

Mr. Kleib (Indonesia): Mr. Chair, allow me to read out the national statement of Indonesia on behalf of my Permanent Representative.

> "Mr. Chair, let me first congratulate you on your election as Chair of the Disarmament Commission at this very important session. I also congratulate the members of the Bureau and the Chair of Working Group II on their respective elections. Indonesia looks forward to participating and contributing actively in Commission deliberations which, we are confident, will produce tangible results under the very able stewardship of you and your team members.

"My delegation associates itself with the statement made yesterday on behalf of Non-Aligned Movement.

"We thank the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs for his remarks. They remind us of the Commission's great potential for achieving consensus on the various critical issues in the field of disarmament. Indeed, there is great potential in the Commission for making concrete advances on the disarmament and non-proliferation agenda. The international community's expectations that we do so are high. It is Indonesia's hope that, just as in 1999 when the Commission achieved consensus on the guidelines for establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones and regarding conventional arms control, we will again bring our respective political capital to bear on generating an outcome befitting this year's session.

"Indonesia expects that, in keeping with resolution 65/86, as well as earlier mandates, this session will finalize an agreement on the elements of a draft declaration of the 2010s as the fourth disarmament decade. Even though the Working Group on this topic could not conclude its work last year, there was a very meaningful discussion on the whole spectrum of disarmament issues. We encourage all Member States to build and expand on the common points forged last year in order to produce a comprehensive and principles-based result.

"Similarly, we need to do our utmost to reach agreement on concrete recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in all their aspects. We hope that upon the successful conclusion of the preparation of the elements for the declaration on the fourth disarmament decade, we will also see forward-looking work on the agenda of practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons.

"While the challenges in the field of global nuclear disarmament are obvious, there have been some optimistic signs. The outcome of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the New START agreement between the United States and the Russian Federation are encouraging. Indonesia welcomes every opportunity to advance the multilateral disarmament and non-proliferation agenda.

"As we are mindful that such developments, vital as they are, are not an end unto themselves, we must all use these developments as building blocks that enhance support for the edifice to bring about total nuclear disarmament. In that regard, the importance of dialogue, mutual respect and cooperation among countries and political groupings cannot be emphasized enough.

"The expectation of the overwhelming majority of global citizenry remains that there must be deeper and time-bound actions towards complete nuclear disarmament. In that respect, the nuclear-weapon States should implement their respective undertakings with regard to nuclear disarmament.

"Indonesia views the role of the Disarmament Commission to be all the more important in facilitating an exchange of various viewpoints, given the optimistic international movements in the field of disarmament and in building consensus on the issues on its agenda.

"My delegation underscores the significance of the Disarmament Commission as the only specialized, authoritative and deliberative part of the United Nations disarmament machinery. The Commission, as the only institution of universal membership that can sustain in-depth deliberations on the critical issues at stake through substantive recommendations for achieving disarmament goals, must continue to be central to international efforts.

"To effectively tackle and achieve success on the challenges of disarmament and non-proliferation, it is crucial that we all work together to materialize our respective undertakings and support the aims of the Commission.

"For its part, Indonesia assures all Member States of its constructive engagement and cooperation. We are certain that through cooperation and collaboration among delegations, and by exhibiting the requisite political will, we can bring about a genuinely substantive and

result-oriented session of this vital body that is the Disarmament Commission."

Mr. Bavaud (Switzerland): The Swiss delegation would like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the Chair of the 2011 session of the Disarmament Commission and to wish you every success in that role. We also wish to extend our congratulations to the other members of the Bureau.

Switzerland welcomes the activities that have been carried out during the past year by Working Groups I and II, which addressed, respectively, recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, and elements of a draft declaration for the 2010s as the fourth disarmament decade. My delegation will also continue to pursue its commitment by giving consideration to practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons before concluding this three-year cycle. I wish to take this opportunity to assure you, Sir, of the full support of my delegation in the performance of your tasks.

(*spoke in French*)

The arms control and disarmament processes have long played a crucial role in maintaining security and promoting peace at the international level. By providing a response to the challenges posed by such issues as illegal and uncontrolled trafficking in conventional arms and armed conflict, these processes also contribute to strengthening human security, the protection of human rights and economic development. The fact that the multilateral disarmament bodies have been blocked for far too many years is therefore a matter of particular concern. The consequences are significant and are already making themselves felt. If a way out cannot be found, these consequences will become more acute in the future.

Indeed, disarmament bodies no longer seem to be able to provide answers to the challenges they face. One of the reasons for that shortcoming lies in the fact that numerous players are focusing their attention primarily on considerations of national security instead of on more global issues. This kind of narrow approach is no longer appropriate, since today national interests and global security can no longer be separated. New impetus is therefore required in order to redress the imbalance between the acuteness of the problems and the lack of progress on them.

The main objective of the Disarmament Commission as a specialized and deliberative forum within the United Nations disarmament mechanism is to reinforce or create disarmament norms by submitting concrete recommendations to the General Assembly. In the past, such recommendations have demonstrated the Commission's added value. However, this body has not been able to adopt any recommendations of substance for more than 11 years now. The value that it provides to the disarmament and arms control processes therefore needs to be reassessed.

Potential measures for remedying this situation need to be examined in greater depth. The deadlock faced by the Disarmament Commission is to some extent tied to the fact that it has two items on its agenda, namely, nuclear arms and conventional weapons. This gives rise to a situation that hardly encourages progress, since lack of progress in one area results in deadlock in the other. The option of limiting the Commission's agenda to one item would therefore be worth examining. The Disarmament Commission could thus become an innovator in the areas it deals with. It could address the issue of experiences in implementation and best practices in this domain. It could even address the matter of the revitalization of the disarmament machinery, which is indeed a topical issue.

There are also other options that could be examined more closely. One such option is for the Disarmament Commission to serve as an intersessional meeting on disarmament for the annual session of the General Assembly. Another option would be to allow the Chair of the Commission to submit a report to the General Assembly in his own name. If there should be a lack of consensus on whether to allow the Disarmament Commission to become more active, reducing its duration from two weeks to one would also be a measure worth considering.

I would also like to comment on other aspects of the disarmament machinery. The Conference on Disarmament is the sole permanent multilateral forum for negotiations in the area of disarmament. It is an essential instrument for all States, large or small, to further their interests in terms of security. Its inability to undertake any negotiations for the past 13 years is therefore all the more unacceptable.

Switzerland is anxious to ensure that steps are taken to render the Conference on Disarmament functional again. We are willing to participate in negotiations on all the main items on the agenda. We believe that it is particularly important that rapid progress be made with respect to prohibiting the production of fissile materials for the production of nuclear weapons, preventing an arms race in outer space and promoting nuclear disarmament.

The events that took place at the beginning of this year have strengthened Switzerland's conviction that the procedures governing this forum are contributing to its inability to act. These procedures were developed during the Cold War and are no longer entirely appropriate today. Even if there is common political will to move forward, any such movement is being thwarted by particularly restrictive rules of procedure. Therefore, specific security considerations are systematically taking precedence over considerations of a more global nature.

While we believe that the existence of a permanent forum entrusted with the task of negotiating legal instruments relating to disarmament is something that is as relevant today as it has been in the past, the current situation nonetheless prompts us to ask serious questions. If the existing mechanism no longer functions and is itself one of the reasons for the current deadlock, we have to ask ourselves whether we should adopt a different approach.

We welcome the fact that efforts are being made to finally put an end to the deadlock that is hampering disarmament mechanisms. An initiative undertaken at several levels represents the best way to make progress in the current situation. The High-level Meeting convened by the Secretary-General on 24 September 2010 was a first step in that direction, which was complemented by the adoption of a General Assembly resolution concerning follow-up measures (resolution 65/93). In our view, it is both logical and appropriate to quickly move on to the next phase. A debate at the expert level needs to be held within the scope of the General Assembly before the end of the sixty-fifth session. Such an event would support the action that has already been taken and would facilitate an evaluation of the progress that has been made since September's High-level Meeting.

Switzerland also believes that the debate that was initiated at the Meeting should be incorporated into the activities of the sixty-sixth session of the General Assembly. We would hope that this would give rise to the identification of initial solutions that would enable us to find a way out of this difficult situation.

We also hope that the Advisory Board on Disarmament Matters will be able to make a substantial and constructive contribution towards that process. We hope that it will also be able to take into account the concerns and hopes of all States in its deliberations. In our view, the Advisory Board should focus specifically on the key problems of the difficulty in reaching consensus in both the Disarmament Commission and the Conference on Disarmament, the necessity of reviewing the rules concerning participation in the Conference and the rules of procedure and agenda of that forum. It should also examine issues that have not been subject to genuine analyses to date — for example, determining whether a body like the Disarmament Commission, which has a uniquely deliberative function, still makes sense today, or whether the functions of this body should be consolidated with those of the Conference on Disarmament.

With each passing year, it becomes increasingly difficult to accept the deadlock that is hampering disarmament bodies. The consequences of this deadlock are also becoming more severe. The challenges faced by the international community are not being met with a suitable response and are growing increasingly acute and difficult to overcome. In this situation, it appears to us that it is also becoming increasingly difficult to maintain that a comprehensive review of the disarmament mechanisms or a fundamentally new approach in this sector are not necessary. I would like to conclude by saying that, as far as Switzerland is concerned, we will do everything in our power to overcome the current deadlock.

Mr. Rao (India): At the outset, let me congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the Chair of the Disarmament Commission. I assure you of my delegation's full support in the discharge of your responsibilities. Let me also express my appreciation for the important contributions to our debate by the Secretary-General and his High Representative for Disarmament Affairs.

India associates itself with the statement made by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

India attaches great importance to the United Nations disarmament machinery that was put in place by consensus at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. As the specialized deliberative organ, the Disarmament Commission forms a vital part of that machinery. It offers Member States a unique opportunity to bridge differences and arrive at principles and recommendations with potential for universal acceptance. India believes that the Commission can play a central role in developing consensus on the disarmament issues faced by the international community.

With regard to Working Group I on "Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons", we have had an extensive exchange of views both in the last cycle and in the last two years of this cycle. However, although we came close to doing so in 2008, it has not been possible to arrive at a consensus on these recommendations. India remains willing to engage constructively with a view to developing such consensus in this year's meetings.

Nuclear disarmament remains the highest priority for India and the Non-Aligned Movement. India has been consistent in its support for global, complete and verifiable nuclear disarmament. In 1988, Prime Minister Shri Rajiv Gandhi presented an Action Plan for a nuclear-weapon-free and non-violent world order to the third special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (see A/S-15/PV.14). The Plan postulated reaching a nuclear-weapon-free world in stages by 2010. The end of the Cold War kept the hope alive that we would be able to reach that goal, but it was not to be. We are no nearer to attaining that goal today than we were in 1988. The imperative need to move towards the goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons remains as valid today as it was two decades ago. We welcome the recent high-level reaffirmations of this need.

In June 2008, on the twentieth anniversary of the Rajiv Gandhi Action Plan, Prime Minister Manmohan Singh asked others to join India in taking the critical first step — a commitment, preferably a binding legal commitment through an international instrument, to eliminate nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework. Other leaders have also expressed their commitment to seek the goal of global zero.

India believes that nuclear disarmament can be achieved by a step-by-step process underwritten by a universal commitment and an agreed multilateral framework for achieving global and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament. We also believe that progressive steps for the de-legitimization of nuclear weapons are essential to achieving the goal of their complete elimination. Measures to reduce nuclear dangers arising from the accidental or unauthorized use of nuclear weapons, increasing restraints on the use of nuclear weapons and de-alerting of nuclear weapons are all pertinent in that regard.

India's resolutions in the First Committee on a "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons" (resolution 65/80) and "Reducing nuclear danger" (resolution 65/60) give expression to some of these steps and have justifiably found support from a large number of countries. These steps were also part of a working paper presented by India at the 2007 session of the Disarmament Commission. The intent of the working paper, which reflects the spirit and substance of the Rajiv Gandhi Action Plan, was to stimulate debate and discussion on nuclear disarmament.

The countries with the largest arsenals bear a special responsibility for progress on nuclear disarmament. In this regard, we welcome the ratification of the New START agreement between the United States and the Russian Federation. These two countries still hold more than 90 per cent of the nuclear weapons in the world, and the New START is a step in the right direction. We believe that there is a need for a meaningful dialogue among all States possessing nuclear weapons to build trust and confidence and for reducing the salience of nuclear weapons in international affairs and security doctrines.

Nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation are mutually reinforcing processes. We believe that the expansion of nuclear energy and the reduction of proliferation risks must go hand in hand. The possibility of nuclear material falling into the hands of terrorists is real and could have catastrophic consequences. We are happy that our resolution on this issue entitled "Measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction" is adopted by consensus in the General Assembly every year.

Working Group II, on "Elements of a draft declaration of the 2010s as the fourth disarmament

decade", held substantive discussions on the revised draft last year, although consensus again eluded us. We hope that the discussions this year will see a greater convergence of views and that we will be able to achieve consensus on this important item.

The draft declaration should reflect the aspirations of the international community in the field of disarmament. We should aim at finding consensus on elements that will be of enduring validity, that uphold the priority of nuclear disarmament and the complete elimination of all weapons of mass destruction, that address other dimensions of global security, including space security, and that strengthen the international framework for addressing issues related to conventional arms, including small arms and light weapons and preventing their use by terrorists. As is its tradition, the Disarmament Commission should focus on these issues of security, taking into account the global interdependence of peoples and nations.

The third item on our agenda is "Practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons". This issue was also deliberated upon in two previous cycles of Commission's work. Although we are sceptical of how much progress can be achieved in the short time available this year, given that we have not deliberated the question in this cycle, we are ready for substantive deliberations on this issue.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate that the Disarmament Commission is an important part of the multilateral disarmament machinery. My delegation is committed to working constructively in the coming weeks for the success of this session of the Commission.

Mr. Briens (France) (*spoke in French*): My country associates itself with the statement made on behalf of the European Union, as well as with the words of congratulations expressed to the Chair. I would like to set out a number specific points with regard to the French position.

France expresses the wish that this session of the Disarmament Commission, which brings to an end a three-year cycle, will be useful and fit within the new momentum seen in the international community in the past year. Whether it be the adoption of a comprehensive action plan at the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the entry into the force of the Oslo Convention on Cluster Munitions or, more recently, the entry into force of the New START agreement and the constructive spirit that prevailed during the second session of the Preparatory Committee of the 2012 Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty, the successes achieved over the past year amply demonstrate that we can make headway in the field of disarmament when an open and constructive spirit prevails.

This new momentum also demonstrates that the quest for a safer world is an issue that must be addressed in a comprehensive, balanced and concrete manner. Mobilization therefore remains necessary in all fields, including the nuclear, biological, chemical, conventional, ballistic missile proliferation and outer space. France believes that this comprehensive approach should be at the heart of our discussions on the draft declaration on the fourth disarmament decade.

We furthermore welcome the creation this year, pursuant to resolution 65/86, of a third Working Group devoted to practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons. It is important that its work not be deferred on the basis of the pace of work of the other two Working Groups.

In the nuclear field, our road map is now made up of the action plans adopted by consensus at the end of the most recent NPT Review Conference, which addressed the nuclear issue in a comprehensive and balanced fashion. Each State party must meet its part of the contract in order to move towards a safer world.

The five permanent members of the Security Council (P-5) are ready to shoulder their responsibility in that regard. That is why, on France's invitation, the first P-5 follow-up meeting to the NPT Review Conference will be held in Paris on 30 June. This initiative bears witness to France's commitment to make progress on this issue and illustrates the resolve of the P-5 to pursue the implementation of specific actions geared towards ensuring full respect for their commitments under the NPT. The meeting will also fit within the rationale of transparency championed by the President of the French Republic in Cherbourg in March 2008 and established in London in September 2009 between the P-5 partners.

We should also strengthen the multilateral framework, prompting all States that have not yet done so, especially annex 2 countries, to quickly ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and to negotiate immediately a fissile material cut-off treaty.

These negotiations should be conducted within the Conference on Disarmament, on which falls that responsibility, and include the whole host of stakeholders involved. To that end, we remain open with respect to innovative measures that will allow the process to move forward. We also call for the immediate establishment of a moratorium on the production of fissile material.

All States must contribute to disarmament by creating the requisite security environment. This means, first and foremost, putting an end to proliferation. I am thinking in particular of North Korea and Iran. France continues to make a special effort in all forums to prevent and reduce this grave threat to international security, including within the Group of Eight (G-8), of which we now hold the presidency.

Furthermore, France supports efforts to implement the 1995 resolution on the Middle East. The 2010 NPT Review Conference allowed for major progress. We should all work on the conditions that will allow the conference scheduled for 2012 to take place with all relevant stakeholders. With this in mind, we support the initiative of the European Union to organize a seminar on the matter.

As I have already noted, France is working in all fields contributing to general and complete disarmament. The Seventh Review Conference for the Biological Weapons Convention, which will be held in December, is one of the major encounters ahead of us. On 15 March, G-8 Ministers for Foreign Affairs, under the French presidency, adopted a declaration with that in mind. We call for strengthening the Convention's regime through the development of a new five-year programme of work, the quest for more effective means of improving compliance with the Convention, improving confidence-building measures and renewing the mandate of the Implementation Support Unit. We also call on all States that have not yet done so to accede to the Convention, since it is a major tool for our collective security.

France furthermore supports, particularly upon the occasion of its G-8 presidency, all concrete efforts to combat the proliferation of ballistic missiles, which is a matter of major concern for the international community given the increased development of ballistic programmes over recent years.

During our chairmanship of The Hague Code of Conduct, which ends in May, we have sought to focus our efforts on promoting the universalization of the Code and on strengthening its actual functioning. In that regard, I would like to welcome the accession of your country of Iraq, Mr. Chair, to The Hague Code of Conduct. This is a tangible step that can contribute to progress towards the objective of making the Middle East a region free from weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems.

I should now like to turn to conventional weapons. France welcomes the positive and constructive atmosphere prevailing in the work that has taken place thus far on negotiations on an arms trade treaty. The list of equipment discussed to be covered under the treaty seems sufficiently broad and operational. We continue to believe that respect for human rights, international humanitarian law and economic and social development should feature among the criteria for assessing such transfers.

We were in Vientiane last November to welcome the entry into force of the Oslo Convention and begin work on its effective implementation. We would also hope that the work negotiating a sixth protocol to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons to deal with cluster munitions would also bear fruit at the review conference to be held in November.

Finally, we would like to see an increased effort on small arms and light weapons. We hope that next May's meeting of the Group of Governmental Experts on the marking, tracing and registering of small arms and light weapons will provide for a fruitful exchange of views.

This handful of issues shows what we are capable of achieving — not in the distant future but in the coming months and years — to collectively create a safer world. We hope that our discussions during this session will reflect the challenges ahead of us. The Chair can count on the support of our delegation in participating in such debates in a constructive spirit.

Mr. Benítez Versón (Cuba) (*spoke in Spanish*): On behalf of the Cuban delegation, I would like to congratulate the Chair and the rest of the members of the Bureau on their election to lead the work of the Disarmament Commission. We wish them every success.

Cuba fully supports the statements made by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) and by the representative of Chile on behalf of the Rio Group.

Sixty million people had to die in the Second World War for the leaders of the time to create the United Nations in order to "save succeeding generations from the scourge of war". More than 65 years later, despite the deep economic and environmental crises affecting the world, military expenditures, instead of decreasing, are increasing at an accelerated rate. In the past 10 years, arms expenditures have grown by 49 per cent, reaching the astronomical figure of $1.5 trillion. One country alone is responsible for nearly half the global military expenditures.

With the resources currently devoted to armaments we could fight the extreme poverty afflicting 1.4 billion people today; feed the more than 1.02 billion hungry people in the world; prevent the deaths of 11 million children who die from hunger and preventable diseases every year; or teach 759 million illiterate adults to read and write. While tens of millions of human beings, victims of poverty and preventable and curable diseases, die, unjustifiable wars continue to be waged, as is happening in Libya today. Such wars are never the solution and always cause thousands of deaths, astonishingly called collateral damage.

A new global order is needed, based on human solidarity and justice, in which conflicts are settled on the basis of dialogue, negotiation and adherence to the principles of non-interference and the sovereign equality of States, and where the philosophy of dispossession leading to war and the use of force ceases to exist.

For Cuba, the Commission's adoption this year of recommendations to achieve nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is a high priority. Our country, together with the other members of NAM, has submitted a comprehensive and detailed working paper to the Commission's Working Group I, which contains concrete recommendations to achieve nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. We propose that that NAM document be used as a basis for reaching an agreement on that important issue.

Deteriorating living conditions in the world as a result of global warming, and the existence of nuclear weapons constitute, in Cuba's view, the main challenges to the survival of the human species. The use of only a negligible part of the huge global nuclear arsenal, that is, the explosion of 100 warheads, would bring about nuclear winter in a few hours.

Despite the end of the Cold War, there are still some 23,300 nuclear weapons, almost half of which are ready for immediate use. The mere existence of such weapons and doctrines that prescribe their possession and use pose a serious threat to international peace and security. That is why nuclear disarmament is, and must remain, the highest priority in the field of disarmament.

The only guarantee that nuclear weapons will not be used is their complete elimination and prohibition. The political manipulation of non-proliferation, based on double standards and the existence of a club of the privileged that continues to improve its nuclear weapons, while there are attempts to question the inalienable right of the countries of the South to the peaceful use of nuclear energy, must stop. We must abandon once and for all the nuclear deterrence doctrine, which, far from contributing to nuclear disarmament, perpetuates the possession of such armaments.

Cuba is ready to negotiate, in parallel with the Conference of Disarmament, a treaty that eliminates and prohibits nuclear weapons; a treaty that bans an arms race in outer space; a treaty that provides effective security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States; and a treaty that bans the production of fissile material for the manufacture of nuclear weapons. We believe that the negotiation of a treaty on fissile material is a positive but insufficient measure if subsequent steps to achieve nuclear disarmament are not defined.

The outcome of last year's Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons was mixed. Modest steps forward were agreed. However, the Final Document (A/CONF.2010/590 (Vol. I)) also has significant limitations, is inadequate and is still far from what is currently needed. We made every possible effort for the action plan adopted by the Review Conference to include a time frame with well-defined actions, setting the year 2025 as the deadline to achieve the total elimination of nuclear weapons. Regrettably, that was

not reflected in the Final Document owing to the position of some nuclear-weapon States interested in preserving the unacceptable status quo.

Nuclear disarmament cannot continue to be a conditional goal that is continually postponed. It is simply unacceptable that in today's world, there are still tens of thousands of nuclear weapons with the capacity to destroy the world several times over.

It is important that this year the Disarmament Commission recommend a draft declaration of the current decade as the fourth disarmament decade to the General Assembly. That declaration must properly reflect the disarmament priorities that we States have agreed. The designation of a fourth disarmament decade would help to mobilize international efforts in response to current and emerging disarmament challenges.

Lastly, with regard to the new item on practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons, Cuba will make known its positions and proposals, as appropriate, during the debate.

Mr. Churkin (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): The work of this session takes place in a particular context against the backdrop of landmark positive events, namely, the entry into force of the Russian-American New START agreement and the successful holding of the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

The negotiating process within the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva has remained deadlocked for many years. It is important to fully support and develop that intensified process of multilateral disarmament diplomacy, to strengthen existing international non-proliferation and arms control mechanisms and to establish new instruments where necessary.

The three-year cycle of the Commission's work is coming to an end. In that regard, I would like to highlight Russia's priorities. As one of the major nuclear States, the Russian Federation reaffirms its commitment to the obligations under article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. In that connection, a long-term strategic task of the foreign policy laid down by the President of the Russian Federation, Mr. Medvedev, is the ultimate goal of building a world free of nuclear weapons. We intend to strive for consistent progress towards that goal.

Russia has recently taken many historic steps. The Treaty on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms of 1991 and the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty of 2002 have been successfully implemented. To replace those two treaties, a new agreement with the United States on the further reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms was drawn up and signed. The new Treaty entered into force on 5 February and both sides have started to implement it.

By establishing irreversible, verifiable and transparent strategic arms reductions, the Treaty will strengthen not only the security of Russia and the United States, but international stability as a whole. Its implementation will lead to strengthening the nuclear non-proliferation regime and furthering the nuclear disarmament process. We look forward to the principles of the equality, parity and indivisible security of the parties to the Treaty serving as a new standard for all subsequent disarmament and arms control agreements, whether bilateral or multilateral.

We are also ready to discuss further reductions in nuclear arsenals. At the same time, it is our belief that a favourable international environment is required for this to happen. It is important to recall that Russia and the United States are not the only States that should shoulder the burden of nuclear responsibility. Against the backdrop of the significant nuclear reductions being carried out bilaterally, there is an increasing urgency to expand the disarmament process by making it multilateral in nature.

Furthermore, we consider that it would be wrong to limit the disarmament process to the endeavours of the States parties to the NPT. We call on all nuclear-weapon States to make an active contribution to the disarmament process. We believe that the elimination of nuclear weapons will be attainable only as the result of a comprehensive, step-by-step disarmament process, with strategic stability being maintained and the principle of equal and indivisible security for all being strictly followed.

Under current conditions, further nuclear arms reductions are inconceivable if due account is not taken of all the factors involved in international security that may adversely affect strategic stability. Such factors include the prospect of weapons in space, plans to

create strategic offensive non-nuclear-weapons systems, a unilateral build-up in terms of strategic missile defence and a growing imbalance in conventional arms. Strategic offensive and defensive armaments are inextricably linked. The deeper we go in terms of the reduction of strategic offensive armaments, the more careful and balanced we should be with respect to the deployment of anti-ballistic-missile defence systems. Missile defence deployment, if it is untrammeled and bears no relation to real missile-related threats and challenges, may trigger retaliatory measures and ratchet up the arms race. That cannot be allowed to happen.

Clearly, these problems will not be easy to solve. We welcome responsible steps in this area and pay due attention to the ideas and initiatives on nuclear disarmament introduced in the international community, in the context of maintaining a constructive dialogue with all interested parties. In that respect, we believe in the continued relevance of Russia's initiative to establish a universal legal regime based on the 1987 Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty in order to eliminate intermediate- and shorter-range missiles, and its initiative to return all nuclear weapons to within their owners' national territories and destroy the infrastructure of their sites abroad.

The decisions taken by the 2010 NPT Conference are a reliable benchmark for the strengthening of the non-proliferation regime. They are based on a clear balance among the three main components of the NPT: non-proliferation, nuclear disarmament and the peaceful use of nuclear energy.

Russia supports the idea of launching negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament in the framework of its balanced programme of work on a fissile material cut-off treaty. There is also a need to ensure that the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) comes into force as soon as possible.

We strongly urge all States, especially those on which entry into force of the CTBT depends, to sign and ratify the Treaty without delay. We also continue to support the process of establishing zones free of nuclear weapons and of other weapons of mass destruction. We consider this to be an important and effective tool for strengthening the non-proliferation regime.

On 20 March, Russia ratified the Protocols to the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty. We expect all other nuclear-weapon States that have not yet done the same to follow our example. For the near future, the implementation of the 1995 resolution on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems also remains a priority. In particular, we support the convening of a special international conference on this issue in 2012. We are ready, together with the other depositaries to the NPT and the Secretary-General, to do everything necessary to implement this decision. We have already undertaken work to that end.

However, that goal can be achieved only if all the parties involved adopt a constructive attitude, especially the States of the Middle East themselves, whose political will will determine how productive the process of establishing such a zone will be. An important outcome of the 2010 NPT Review Conference is the determination of the best means of providing unimpeded access for all States parties to the Treaty to the benefits of the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

There is a growing global understanding of the fact that the exercise of the legitimate interests of many countries in this field requires a modern, proliferation-resistant architecture of international cooperation in the sphere of Atoms for Peace — an architecture that is based on stringent mechanisms for the verification of non-proliferation obligations and on multilateral approaches to the nuclear fuel cycle that offer a feasible alternative to the development by States on their own territory of elements of a nuclear fuel cycle that are costly and sensitive from the standpoint of non-proliferation.

With that goal in mind, Russia established the International Uranium Enrichment Centre in Angarsk, where an assured supply of low-enriched uranium, managed by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), has been set up. It can already be used by any State observing its non-proliferation obligations. We deem it necessary also to continue to support jointly the international community's calls for the progressive development of the IAEA safeguards system and the universalization of the safeguards agreement and its additional protocol as the commonly recognized standard of verification of States' compliance with their non-proliferation obligations as one of the fundamental conditions of nuclear exports control.

We note the increasing importance to the international community of reliable mechanisms for tackling and countering the threats that may result if sensitive nuclear materials and technologies fall into the hands of non-State actors. International cooperation to ensure the security of nuclear facilities and to counter illicit trafficking in nuclear materials is of strategic importance.

We must jointly contribute to the universalization of the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism. We stress the importance of the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism and the development of best practices for the identification of nuclear materials. All of these efforts deserve targeted support, including in our forum.

One of the priorities of Russian foreign policy remains the prevention of the placement of weapons in outer space. The time is nigh for the international community to proceed to serious, substantive work in this respect. The basis for such an undertaking already exists: the draft China-Russia treaty on the prevention of the placement of weapons in outer space and of the threat or use of force against outer space. We believe that our immediate task is to initiate comprehensive discussion on this issue in the Conference on Disarmament and thus pave the way for future substantive negotiations.

An important element of our efforts to prevent the placement of weapons in outer space is the elaboration of outer-space transparency and confidence-building measures. During our five years' work on this matter in the framework of the United Nations, we have done considerable groundwork through proposals on such transparency and confidence-building measures. This undertaking, which has moved to a qualitatively new level as a result of joint efforts, took shape in the form of the creation of a group of governmental experts. We thank everyone for their support for the corresponding resolution — General Assembly resolution 65/68.

Starting in 2012, the group will be conducting a study on outer-space transparency and confidence-building measures, at the required expert level. We believe that the end product of the Group's work could be an international document on rules of conduct in outer space. Recently, there has been some reinvigoration of efforts to resolve problems related to the strengthening and modernization of the conventional arms control regime in Europe, but that process has not yet become irreversible. The most important goal is to reach agreement on a mandate for future negotiations, which are scheduled to begin this year.

Russia is not putting forward any preconditions, assuming that all participants in the negotiations may bring up any questions of concern to them. We are counting on our partners to adopt the same constructive approach. Breaking off a dialogue would not serve the interests of European security.

The Russian Federation calls for the consolidation of United Nations efforts to combat the uncontrolled proliferation of small arms and light weapons. We will take an active part in the Open-ended Meeting of Governmental Experts on the Implementation of the Programme of Action on small arms and light weapons, to be held in May 2011.

We also support the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms. The Register remains the only global instrument for transparency, allowing a close watch to be kept on such arms. We do not welcome the recent downward trend in the number of national reports. We are keen to see a further universalization of the Register, on the understanding that the main goal should be to improve the efficiency of its functioning.

We share the view that it is necessary to put some order into the global circulation of conventional arms. We consider the fact that the international community has begun to deal with this issue to be an important step in the right direction. We support the holding of further discussions on an international arms trade treaty in the framework of the United Nations. We consider the principles of comprehensive coverage, inclusiveness and consensus-based decision-making to be exceptionally important here. We are interested in the elaboration of a well-balanced document that will conform to the highest international standards and be aimed at addressing specific problems. Our paramount goal should be to combat illicit arms trafficking.

Our work in the Disarmament Commission is an integral part of our effort to ensure international security. The Russian delegation is ready to work constructively, and we intend to do our level best to find solutions that are generally acceptable to all.

Mr. Barriga (Liechtenstein): My delegation conveys its sincere congratulations to all members of the Bureau upon their election.

The ultimate goal of disarmament is to prevent human suffering. As a small and unarmed State, Liechtenstein approaches disarmament in the context of human rights and international humanitarian law, and we encourage cross-linkages to those thematic areas. We believe that it is imperative to strike the right balance between visionary goals and practical disarmament measures, which can serve to have an immediate effect.

Last year, the States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) adopted a Final Document (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol. I)) that contained innovative and forward-looking measures, especially in the action plan on nuclear disarmament. We recall in particular the recognition by the NPT Review Conference that international humanitarian law also applies in the context of nuclear weapons. We also recall the recognition of the legitimate interest of non-nuclear-weapon States in the de-alerting of nuclear weapons. My delegation also joined the call of many others for a nuclear weapons convention, in line with the Secretary-General's five-point plan. Now is the time to translate the commitments made at the Conference into actions, especially the commitment made by nuclear-weapon States to discuss policies leading to the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons.

Liechtenstein continues to support the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), which we have ratified. The CTBT Organization's international monitoring mechanism has once again proven that it works. In the aftermath of the recent nuclear catastrophe in Japan, the worldwide network of monitoring stations was able to detect the smallest quantities of radioactive particles as they spread all over the globe.

We must utilize the renewed momentum in the field of disarmament to achieve true progress in the Conference on Disarmament. The Conference should heed the General Assembly's calls for an early negotiation of a fissile material cut-off treaty, which remains the most achievable of all the tasks on the Conference's agenda. Continued inaction by that body, which since 1996 has only once been able to agree on a programme of work, is no longer acceptable.

Similarly, the Disarmament Commission meets for three weeks every year, but for the past 12 years it has not succeeded in producing any substantive outcome, except for bills for conference services. Liechtenstein therefore believes that the time has come to reconsider the purpose and working methods of this body. If the status quo persists, the General Assembly must necessarily reconsider the present disarmament architecture in its entirety.

Liechtenstein also firmly believes in transparency as one of the most important confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons. It is in this spirit that we report to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and the United Nations System for the Standardized Reporting of Military Expenditures. We encourage other States to do the same. However, as a small State with limited administrative resources, we are aware of the heavy burden that the various disarmament resolutions place on States that wish to report and submit their views to the Secretary-General. We therefore encourage the Secretariat to develop a consolidated reporting tool. That would ease the bureaucratic burden placed on small and developing States and encourage increased reporting.

Let me also take this opportunity to reaffirm Liechtenstein's firm support for a strong, effective and comprehensive arms trade treaty. We were heartened by the quality of discussions at the second session of the Preparatory Committee last month. We were especially pleased by the strong support for the 7+1+1 formula, which would include small arms and light weapons and ammunition within the scope of the treaty. As with disarmament, the ultimate goal of an arms trade treaty should be to reduce human suffering. It is logical, therefore, that the protection of human rights and the promotion of international humanitarian law ought to be stated objectives of the treaty. We look forward to the final session of the Preparatory Committee and the negotiation of a strong and effective treaty next year.

Mr. Ochoa (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): First of all, allow me to congratulate all the members of the Bureau on their election.

In addition to associating ourselves with the statement made yesterday by the representative of Chile on behalf of the Rio Group, Mexico shares the sentiments of the Swedish and Swiss delegations as well as what was just said by the representative of Liechtenstein, who stressed that the mandate of the Disarmament Commission is to hold deliberations with a view to producing substantive recommendations in

the area of disarmament and that the lack of results in more than 10 years of work is completely disheartening.

This reality, along with the deadlock in the Conference on Disarmament, which still has not adopted a programme of work, not only reaffirms the urgent need to discuss mechanisms that revitalize the disarmament machinery within the United Nations system, including the work mechanisms that are used, but it also leads to an entirely negative perception of multilateral diplomacy in this area by people who are looking at the United Nations from outside of its walls.

We, the States Members of the United Nations, representatives of the international community, owe the peoples of our united nations specific results, especially in an area such as nuclear disarmament, where the security of peoples is at stake. We must have the ability to be accountable and to justify the fact that more than $1.5 million is spent for the three weeks that make up the Commission's session, without concrete results. If we do not produce specific results, it will be impossible to explain the expenditure of so much money, without counting that which we have spent over more than 10 years.

Although the nature of this forum is deliberative, we do not believe that it is necessary to reiterate positions that have already been expressed by others in the area of disarmament. We feel that our priority should be to work to produce substantive recommendations on the three items of our agenda, yielding practical results when they are implemented. Positive signs in the area of disarmament lead us to believe that this could be a moment of change. However, the world will judge us by our actions, and not by our words.

The meeting rose at 11.50 a.m.

United Nations A/CN.10/PV.313

General Assembly

Official Records

Disarmament Commission

313th meeting

Tuesday, 5 April 2011, 3 p.m.

New York

Chair: Mr. Al Bayati ..... (Iraq)

In the absence of the Chair, Mr. Sanabria (Spain), Vice-Chair, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

General debate (*continued*)

Mr. Cabactulan (Philippines): The Philippines congratulates the Chair of the Commission and the other members of the Bureau on their well-deserved elections to guide this session of the Disarmament Commission. Likewise, allow me to express my thanks to the Ambassador of Benin for his efforts as Chair at the last session. The Philippines is confident that, under the leadership and guidance of the Bureau, this session of the Commission will yield positive results. Likewise, we welcome the statement made by the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Ambassador Sergio Duarte.

The Philippines fully associates itself with the statement delivered by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement. I wish to highlight and elaborate on a few points.

We have heard in various forums of the prevailing positive atmosphere in disarmament negotiations. Indeed, the disarmament community has much to be proud of, but we can ill afford to revert to the days of inactivity that previously characterized the work of those in disarmament. The positive momentum must be continued in this three-week session. The Philippines maintains the belief that the Disarmament Commission remains a vital mechanism in the field of disarmament. We fully subscribe to the principles and objectives of this body and reaffirm the importance and continuing relevance of the Commission, given its universal membership and ability to submit substantive recommendations on urgent disarmament issues to the General Assembly.

It is the universality of this body of which we must take advantage. In this forum, delegations that are not party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) or members of the Conference on Disarmament can come face to face to share and express views on vital security issues. We must take advantage of the unique character of the Commission and use it to further improve the global peace and security situation for all.

The Philippines believes that, in spite of recent gains made in May 2010 at the Review Conference of the Parties to the NPT, much still has to be done in terms of eliminating the most deadly weapons in existence, namely, nuclear weapons. It is incumbent upon all nations to see to it that these weapons do not spread and are eliminated in an irreversible, transparent and verifiable manner. I wish to highlight that other nations and international organizations must be given the opportunity to participate or be included in any verification process that could lead to the ultimate dismantling of these horrific arsenals. International observers should be given a role to play in future nuclear disarmament efforts.

In this context, the Philippines highly commends the Russian Federation and the United States of America for ratifying the New START agreement and

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

urges those countries to forge ahead and consider more aggressive efforts that would lead to the total elimination of nuclear arms. We also call on all other countries possessing nuclear weapons to follow their lead and pursue negotiations on nuclear disarmament at the earliest opportunity or proceed to disarmament unilaterally. The Philippines firmly believes that the only way to totally eliminate the threat or use of nuclear weapons is their complete destruction.

The Philippines is also firmly committed to the two other pillars of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, namely, nuclear non-proliferation and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. The recent tragic events in Japan highlight the dangers that can arise even in the area of peaceful uses of nuclear energy. In this regard, the Philippines offers its most sincere condolences to the victims of the tragedy that befell Japan less than a month ago. At the same time, we emphasize the need for nuclear security measures. It may be recalled that the consensus outcome of the 2010 Review Conference (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol. I)) included a number of points relating to nuclear security.

These events also bring to the fore the importance of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and efforts that may be required to support it. Aside from the IAEA, the Philippines also recognizes the contribution that was made by the monitoring stations of the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO) in detecting nuclear radiation coming from the damaged plants in Japan, which served as a form of early warning. This is further proof of the usefulness of the CTBTO and the need for the CTBT to enter into force.

The Philippines is a staunch supporter of the CTBT and hosts three of the monitoring stations essential to the CTBTO's operations. The Philippines calls on all States to ban all forms of nuclear testing and urges those States whose signatures and ratifications are necessary for the Treaty to enter into force to sign and ratify it as soon as possible.

The Philippines attaches due importance to the establishment of a universal, legally binding instrument on negative security assurances for non-nuclear-weapon States. Furthermore, we are convinced of the usefulness and necessity of nuclear-weapon-free zones. We welcome the establishment of more such zones and call on nuclear-weapon States to respect them. The Bangkok Treaty is a significant contribution of the Association of South East Asian Nations to this important effort, and we hope that nuclear-weapon States will accede to its Protocol. The Philippines welcomes the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones by the Treaties of Tlatelolco, Rarotonga and Pelindaba and the Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia, and Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status.

We look forward to the early establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East. In this regard, the Philippines hopes that, even with the changes that have occurred in the region, what was agreed upon in the 2010 NPT Review Conference with regard to the 1995 Middle East resolution will still be implemented. This relates in particular to the following three points.

First, the Secretary-General and the sponsors of the 1995 resolution, in consultation with the States of the region, shall convene a conference in 2012, to be attended by all States of the Middle East. Secondly, the Secretary-General and the sponsors of the 1995 resolution, in consultation with the States of the region, shall appoint a facilitator, with a mandate to support the implementation of the 1995 resolution by conducting consultations with the States of the region, and in that regard shall undertake preparations for the convening of the 2012 conference. Thirdly, the Secretary-General and the sponsors of the 1995 Middle East resolution, in consultation with the States of the region, shall designate a host Government for the 2012 conference.

The Philippines understands that if the 2012 conference is to be a success, all nations in the region must attend, participate and negotiate. The conference should not be turned into a blaming-and-naming forum, where participating delegations are singled out and condemned. Participants need to come to the conference with an open mind and a sincere desire to negotiate. It is possible that the conference may not result in tangible agreements that would create the zone outright, but it could serve as the beginning of a process that would eventually lead to what we all want to see in that part of the world.

It is therefore extremely important that those who have been charged with taking action must carry out their tasks with haste, given the fact that 2012 is already fast approaching. Specifically, the Philippines

hopes that a facilitator and host Government will be selected soon so that adequate preparations can be made for next year's conference.

The Philippines supports calls for an international conference that will set the parameters for the elimination of nuclear weapons and prohibit their production, stockpiling, transfer, and use or threat of use, and provide for the destruction of such weapons. We assign great importance to the identification of a specified time frame for the destruction of such weapons and the negotiation of a nuclear weapons convention, as called for by the Secretary-General in his five-point action plan. Different time frames have been proposed. What is critically important to the Philippines is that any timeline agreed upon in the future be realistic and fall within a reasonable period of time. It defies all logic and reason that non-nuclear-weapon States should wait patiently until such a time as nuclear-weapon States are comfortable enough and willing to eliminate their weapons. This is not what the representatives of the non-nuclear-weapon States that agreed to the indefinite extension of the NPT in 1995 had in mind.

The Philippines, as one of the countries that submitted pleadings to the International Court of Justice, recognizes and unequivocally supports the Court's unanimous conclusion that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and to bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament.

At the start of my statement, I said that the disarmament community had been a victim of atrophy and that recently there had been some forward movement. Unfortunately, this positive momentum has not been taken up by our colleagues in Geneva. The Conference on Disarmament has been a rudderless, directionless ship floating along aimlessly since 1996. The Philippines commends recent initiatives of the Secretary-General, such as the convening of the High-level Meeting on Revitalizing the Work of the Conference on Disarmament in September 2010, and the General Assembly's consensus adoption of resolution 65/93, on follow-up to the High-level Meeting.

The Philippines believes that unless the concerns of some delegations are addressed, the Conference on Disarmament will continue to remain this way. The Philippines only hopes that progress will be achieved in the Conference, and soon.

The Philippines and like-minded and similarly situated observer States to the Conference on Disarmament have called on the Conference to appoint a special rapporteur to examine the question of membership expansion. The limited membership of the Conference on Disarmament is a relic of past historical circumstances. The Conference could certainly be invigorated by the participation and full engagement of nations that are currently kept out.

The Philippines recognizes that multilateral, regional and bilateral discussions should be continuously pursued as the tools to achieve success in this area. We call on States to pursue multilateral negotiations, as agreed in the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2).

We have now entered the fourth disarmament decade, 2010-2020. The work of our predecessors must be continued and the success that was achieved during the first three decades has to be consolidated and built upon aggressively and progressively. The Philippines would therefore like to see the elements of the declaration of the fourth disarmament decade include relevant issues in the field of disarmament, so as to address the concerns of all.

With regard to practical confidence-building measures (CBMs) in the field of conventional arms, the Philippines recognizes these as essential to achieving international peace and security. Conventional weapons, although not as destructive as nuclear weapons, have actually killed and maimed more people due to their proliferation, widespread use and mass production. CBMs establish the climate of trust necessary to the reduction of tensions and the elimination of hostile situations. This, in turn, may lead to further progress in terms of disarmament.

Lastly, the Philippines views multilateral cooperation as a key factor of disarmament. Through this approach, nations can make progress in the important field of disarmament.

In conclusion, the Philippine delegation would like to assure the Chair of the Commission and the members of the Bureau of its readiness to participate in the most constructive and cooperative manner in this

year's substantive session of the Disarmament Commission.

Mr. Khazaee (Islamic Republic of Iran): First of all, I would like to congratulate His Excellency Mr. Al Bayati, the Ambassador of Iraq, on his election as the Chair of the 2011 session of the Disarmament Commission. I am confident that, under his able leadership and with the assistance of the Vice-Chairs, the close cooperation of all representatives and the professional assistance of the Secretariat, this session of the Disarmament Commission will be crowned with success. I assure members of the full cooperation of my delegation towards the successful outcome of this session of the Commission.

I also wish to associate myself with the statement made by the Permanent Representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

My delegation reaffirms the important role and function of the Disarmament Commission as a deliberative body mandated to consider and make recommendations on major disarmament issues. While we do not underestimate the formulation of more than a dozen principles, guidelines and recommendations by the Commission in the past, it is regrettable that the Commission has not been able to formulate an exclusive set of recommendations on nuclear disarmament since its inception, in 1978, while nuclear disarmament has always been the highest priority of the international community. Resolution 1 (I), adopted unanimously by the General Assembly at its first session on 24 January 1946, called for the total elimination of atomic bombs.

Given that the General Assembly, in the Final Document of its first special session devoted to disarmament (resolution S-10/2), strongly emphasized the need for the removal of the threat of nuclear weapons, their total elimination and the prevention of their proliferation, and consequently mandated the Disarmament Commission to follow up on the relevant decisions and recommendations of that session, there are high expectations for the Commission to end its inaction and take the necessary measures with regard to nuclear disarmament, thus fulfilling these long-delayed aspects of its mandate. Accordingly, in our view, the agenda item dealing with nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is of the utmost relevance and importance.

Despite the repeated claims of some nuclear-weapon States regarding their compliance with their legal obligations in the fields of nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the latest facts and figures strongly call into question the validity and credibility of such claims. For instance, the budget request for fiscal year 2012 by a certain nuclear-weapon State not only reveals its considerable plans to modernize its nuclear weapons arsenal and production facilities, including the construction of two new nuclear-weapon production factories, but also discloses its pledge to spend well over $100 billion on modernizing a number of its missiles, submarines and bombers designed to deliver nuclear warheads. Indeed, such measures indisputably constitute non-compliance by the States concerned with their nuclear disarmament obligations.

Such policies and practices, and the fact that nuclear-weapon States continue to believe in the deterrent role of nuclear weapons, indicate the persistent threat posed to humanity by the continued existence and modernization of nuclear weapons, the threat of their use and their possible deliberate or accidental use. Under such circumstances, the international community has no choice but to react collectively by redoubling its efforts to rid the world of the threat of nuclear weapons once and for all.

The Islamic Republic of Iran, along with the overwhelming majority of States, maintains its principled position that the total elimination of nuclear weapons as a matter of the highest priority is the only absolute guarantee against the use or threat of use of such weapons. In this regard, while we support the proposal of the Non-Aligned Movement on the adoption of a legal framework with specified timelines for the total elimination of nuclear weapons by 2025, we emphasize the high priority and major importance of starting negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention and a universal and unconditional legally binding instrument on negative security assurances.

With regard to the stated intention of some nuclear-weapon States to reduce part of their nuclear arsenals, we are of the view that limited bilateral and unilateral arms reductions are far below the expectations of the international community for real and effective steps towards the total elimination of nuclear weapons and can never be a substitute for the obligation of nuclear-weapon States to completely eliminate their nuclear weapons. Moreover, such

reductions should go beyond the mere decommissioning of nuclear weapons and must be irreversible, transparent and internationally verifiable.

At the same time, the lack of progress in nuclear disarmament is not the only challenge facing the international community, as some nuclear-weapon States are proliferating nuclear weapons horizontally and vertically by continuing nuclear-weapon-sharing arrangements with non-nuclear-weapon States and other nuclear-weapon States alike.

The Islamic Republic of Iran believes that the best way to guarantee the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons is the full and non-selective implementation of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We must ensure the universality of the NPT, in particular in the Middle East, where the nuclear weapons programme of the only non-party to the NPT, which has been assisted by France, seriously threatens regional and international peace and security.

To overcome this problem, Iran proposed the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East in 1974. But efforts to establish such a zone have not yet succeeded due to the persistent refusal of the Israeli Zionist regime to join the NPT and to place its nuclear facilities under the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards regime. In this context, the implementation of the relevant resolution of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the NPT (NPT/CONF.1995/32 (Part I), annex) is essential to the establishment of a zone free from nuclear weapons and the universality of the Treaty in the Middle East.

The inalienable right of all NPT parties to develop, research, produce and use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination remains one of the basic pillars of the Treaty. Not only should there be no restrictions on exports of material, equipment and technology for peaceful purposes, but also non-proliferation measures or further progress in strengthening safeguards must not prejudice the national development of peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

As we support all legitimate international efforts towards the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, we express concern over attempts by certain countries to narrow down the three pillars of the NPT to one pillar, non-proliferation, by equating nuclear weapons with nuclear energy, even though the other two pillars are equally important.

The ability to monopolize scientific knowledge and peaceful nuclear energy is an unrealistic illusion. Suppression, deprivation, intimidation and double standards are the main evils that should be removed from international relations. Like other States parties to the NPT, the Islamic Republic of Iran has an inalienable right to the peaceful use of nuclear energy and technology. Iran is determined to exercise that right and, in doing so, it takes its responsibilities seriously. Contrary to the allegations made yesterday on behalf of the European Union, Iran's nuclear activities are and always have been carried out for peaceful purposes. The IAEA has repeatedly confirmed the peaceful nature of the Iranian nuclear programme.

The Islamic Republic Iran has always demonstrated its readiness to negotiate with concerned parties, without preconditions, and reiterates its willingness to engage in serious and constructive negotiations based on justice and mutual respect. It is now up to the other parties to change their past policies and demonstrate their goodwill. We have no doubt that raising such allegations is nothing but an attempt to divert attention from the horrendous record of non-compliance by those countries with their nuclear disarmament obligations, including through nuclear weapon-sharing, hosting nuclear weapons in their territories and assisting the only non-party to the NPT in the Middle East, the Israeli regime, with its nuclear weapons programme.

Accordingly, instead of making unfounded claims against Iran's peaceful nuclear programme, they should fully comply with their obligations in terms of nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, including by addressing the real and immediate threats posed by the hundreds of nuclear weapons deployed on their continent. We stress once again that, in order to ensure equal and sustainable security for all States, the international community has no choice but to resort to the force of logic to avoid the logic of force, and to promote the rule of law.

Finally, we look forward to working with the Chair of the Commission and all delegations towards achieving a successful outcome of the current session of the Commission.

Mr. Proaño (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to begin by congratulating the Republic of

Iraq on the election of its Permanent Representative as Chair of the Disarmament Commission for 2011. I would also like to assure him of my delegation's full cooperation in his work with a view to achieving the stated objectives.

My delegation would like to express its appreciation for the presence of the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Ambassador Sergio Duarte, which underscores the importance of these meetings. Similarly, the delegation of Ecuador associates itself with the statements made by the representatives of Indonesia and Chile on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Rio Group, respectively.

Generally speaking, the subject of disarmament covers two main areas: weapons of mass destruction and conventional weapons. Setting aside the analysis of chemical and biological weapons, for which international conventions banning such weapons have been established, it must be said that, regarding the first component — weapons of mass destruction — only an exclusive group of countries has access to the possession and use of nuclear weapons. Beyond the legality of such weapons, as conferred under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the international community is concerned about the legitimacy of their use and possession. Everyone is aware of the markedly disproportionate emphasis given to the dangers of nuclear non-proliferation in comparison with that given to nuclear disarmament, despite the fact that both are given equal weight under the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

In that regard, the implementation of the third pillar of that instrument — the right of States to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes — is not free of controversy either, given that its benefits have not had the desired impact. It is a sad paradox that we have had to witness how the devastating events of recent years have revealed the dangers inherent in the use and management of nuclear energy. Indeed, that is precisely the pillar intended to benefit the peoples of the world. Given the evidence, one cannot help but be indignant at the stubborn attachment to the continued use of nuclear energy for military purposes as a means of deterrence, when it also well known that such use would have a horrendous and indiscriminate impact, undermining human rights and international humanitarian law and shattering any notion of humanism or humanity.

Thus, if the legitimacy of the mere possession — not to the mention use — of nuclear weapons is being called into question, the need for a legally binding agreement on negative security assurances is legitimate, given the catastrophic consequences of the use or misuse of nuclear weapons, while a legal instrument on nuclear disarmament is being negotiated. The threat of nuclear weapons will be successfully overcome only by their total prohibition and destruction.

Ecuador is clearly in favour of universal disarmament and peace, as well as sustainable development in harmony with nature. In its capacity as a contracting party to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which established the world's first nuclear-weapon-free zone in a densely populated area, Ecuador expresses its strong desire for the details of the 2012 conference on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East to be defined as soon as possible.

With respect to conventional weapons, Ecuador supports the objectives of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, and welcomes the upcoming meeting of the Group of Governmental Experts. Ecuador welcomes the two sessions of the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty, held in July 2010 and February 2011, and offers to actively cooperate in its future sessions. In that regard, Ecuador believes that the instrument emanating from the Conference should be objective, predictable and non-discriminatory, and provide for respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity and the right of peoples to self-determination and self-defence. The success of the treaty will depend on the consideration of all the opinions and criteria set forth by States. Along these lines, we hope to see the negotiations continue as contemplated.

Ecuador regrets the slow progress of the negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament. In this context, we believe that we can no longer delay convening the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, which, in keeping with the agreements reached at the first special session of 1978, should focus on the analysis and evaluation of the functioning of the disarmament machinery — the Conference, the Disarmament Commission and the First Committee — as it formulates alternative solutions for improving its effectiveness.

Finally, I reiterate my delegation's initial offer to work with the Chair and the Disarmament Commission towards our stated goals, which are urgent in the eyes of the international community.

Mrs. Ancidey (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) (*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to begin my statement by congratulating Mr. Al Bayati on his election as Chair of this Commission for 2011. We also extend our congratulations to the other members of the Bureau. We acknowledge and express thanks for the work carried out by the Chair of the Commission and the Chairs of the two Working Groups in 2010. Likewise, Venezuela wishes to acknowledge the work of the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Mr. Sergio Duarte.

My delegation endorses the statements made by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and by the representative of Chile on behalf of the Rio Group.

The proceedings of the Disarmament Commission have begun yet again in the context of great expectations for nuclear disarmament, which, notwithstanding the efforts and commitments entered into, have not yet been fulfilled. The Disarmament Commission, the only specialized deliberative body and of universal composition among the disarmament mechanisms duly established by the United Nations, will allow us to identify ways to develop the elements agreed in the action plan contained in the outcome document (NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol. I)) of last year's Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). In that regard, we are fully committed to the success of the Commission in achieving agreement on the three agenda items: "Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons", "Elements of a draft declaration of the 2010s as the fourth disarmament decade" and "Practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons".

Recent events in the disarmament agenda reaffirm once again that the quest for understanding in this field is without doubt a matter of political will. That is why the Disarmament Commission remains more than ever a fundamental forum for the exchange of opinions and positions on nuclear disarmament, which must be turned into recommendations to the General Assembly. However, we are concerned that the Commission has been unable achieve tangible results for several years now.

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela reiterates its commitment to the achievement of a nuclear-weapon-free world. With that in mind, it acknowledges that this would be an expeditious way to ensure that humankind does not live imperilled and in the shadow of the possible use of such weapons. General and complete nuclear disarmament is an objective inextricably linked to the building of a world of peace.

Since the start of the nuclear-weapon era, the world has lived under the latent threat of a nuclear attack. Many wish to forget that and seek to divert international public attention towards issues that may be important in their own terms but are lower than nuclear disarmament on the scale of priorities, since they do not halt the threat of extermination entailed by nuclear weapons and their ongoing improvement.

The destructive range and degree of a nuclear weapon are vast. Therefore, the mere existence of these weapons without doubt poses one of the gravest dangers to humankind. Those who call for and practice peace continue to await general and complete nuclear disarmament. Venezuela believes that disarmament and non-proliferation efforts should be promoted alongside those to ensure compliance with the objectives of nuclear non-proliferation, horizontal and vertical alike. This is an interdependent process that will make no headway until the nuclear Powers, first and foremost, take concrete steps to honour their commitments.

Although our country had hoped to see broader understanding at the Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) held from 3 to 28 May 2010, its results nevertheless offer an opportunity to strengthen the momentum towards dialogue and the multilateral negotiation of agreements and disarmament measures that would allow us to overcome the unilateralism and distrust that have adversely affected disarmament diplomacy for almost 10 years. My delegation reiterates its appeal to the nuclear-weapon States to comply with the provisions of the NPT, and more specifically those of article VI. At the same time, we reject the selective application of this instrument. Respect for and compliance with the three pillars of the Treaty are essential to striking the balance necessary to strengthening the nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation regime.

Venezuela once more expresses its concern over the strategic defence doctrines currently being promoted by the nuclear Powers as essential to promoting and developing military alliances and military deterrence policies. We wonder how the international community can develop confidence-building measures geared towards disarmament and non-proliferation if we are embroiled in a process characterized by profound distrust and aggravated by such doctrines. That is why Venezuela considers that the negotiation of a legally binding instrument on negative security assurances represents a measure of special importance to disarmament and non-proliferation efforts. Having overcome the tribulations of the Cold War, there is no moral or political justification for the security doctrines of the nuclear Powers to continue to be based on the first-use approach.

Venezuela feels that an agreement on a draft declaration of the 2010s as the fourth disarmament decade would have a very positive impact on international efforts to meet ongoing challenges in disarmament and non-proliferation. At the same time, it would be an effective tool for guaranteeing that the peoples we represent have a safer life. The draft declaration must contain explicit support for the holding of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, for which an organizational session is to be held this year, in accordance with resolution 65/66.

Moreover, the declaration must include specific references to the threats and challenges facing the international community, including, first, the accelerated improvement and modernization of nuclear weapons; secondly, the possible acquisition of these weapons by terrorist groups, even when these weapons are held only by the nuclear-weapon States themselves, which have the prime and absolute responsibility for preventing such diversion; thirdly, the potential use of these systems by nuclear-weapon States against those that have pledged not to develop such technology; and lastly, the concept according to which the only genuine guarantee that these threats will end is the total and complete destruction of such weapons demanded by all humankind.

Therefore, the greatest responsibility for implementing measures to reduce and eliminate nuclear arsenals is incumbent on the nuclear-weapon States, in keeping with the letter and spirit of the NPT, in order to guarantee a safer world free from nuclear threats.

While the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela is perfectly aware of the positive contribution that the implementation of confidence- and security-building measures in the field of conventional weapons can make to the maintenance of international peace and security, it is important, in order to achieve real progress in the fields of disarmament, arms control and non-proliferation, to consider the extension of such voluntary provisions to other types of weapons, in other words, weapons of mass destruction.

With this in mind, Venezuela notes with concern the position of some countries that would prevent the international community from having access to transparent and accurate information on their arsenals of weapons of mass destruction. Likewise, given the tremendous threat posed to humanity by the very existence of such types of weapons and their possible use, progress must be made in establishing confidence-building measures relating to this sphere as well.

Our country believes that the unilateral measures taken by certain countries to apply restrictions or limitations on sales of conventional arms to certain States on the basis of biased political considerations go against the spirit of fostering and promoting confidence and also undermine the legitimate right of all countries to acquire weapons in order to meet their legitimate defence needs.

Venezuela fully supports the creation of a climate of trust and security among all countries. Likewise, we are convinced that the strengthening of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects requires the support of the international community so as to enable continued efforts to be made in support of strengthening international cooperation through mechanisms that are complementary to national efforts. However, we reiterate our appeal that such cooperation be forthcoming without any political conditions, respecting the sovereign right of States to determine their own priorities and needs.

My delegation underscores the importance of the implementation by all States of the International Instrument to Enable States to Identify and Trace, in a Timely and Reliable Manner, Illicit Small Arms and Light Weapons. The negotiation and adoption of that

instrument as a legally binding commitment will facilitate the identification of sources of illicit weapons and consequently will determine their origins as well as the routes used in and the incidence of illicit trafficking.

There is a need to institute systems for the tracing of weapons, not only in the context of import systems but beginning from the very moment when such weapons are manufactured, through the establishment of automated registry systems and the promotion of cooperation in the tracking of arms when they are licitly transferred.

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela highlights as a key factor in tackling this issue the special responsibility incumbent upon the Governments of those States in which public and private companies manufacture such weapons to establish stringent controls that ensure, or at least help to prevent, such weapons from being diverted towards the illicit trade.

The responsibility of States that manufacture such weapons cannot be the same as that of countries that do not produce them. Therefore, in tackling this issue, we must take into account this distinction if we wish measures taken in the context of international cooperation to have a favourable impact on the effective fight against this illicit trade.

I would like to reiterate the readiness and commitment of my delegation to ensure that the proceedings of the Commission are successful.

Ms. Tawfiq (Iraq) (*spoke in Arabic*): Allow me, at the outset, to extend our sincere thanks to participating delegations and to the Group of Asian States for having elected Iraq to the chairmanship of the substantive session of the Disarmament Commission this year. The task entrusted to us at this time has great symbolism for Iraq, given that Iraq is assuming the chairmanship of a disarmament entity for the first time since 1991, when it was subject to sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations owing to the aggressive armament policies adopted by the former regime and used against unarmed Iraqis and their neighbours.

Today Iraq has pledged to live at peace with itself and its neighbours, and it has succeeded in its efforts to see an end put to the restrictions that were imposed by the Security Council for reasons that are well known to all. It was been able, with the help and support of friends, to have those restrictions removed by the Security Council by its resolution 1957 (2010), and it is taking steps to regain its place in the international community as a cooperative country that is active in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation.

Having congratulated the Chair, I should like also to congratulate the other members of the Bureau on their election, and the Secretariat for the excellent work it has been doing. My delegation would also like to associate itself with the statement made by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement.

My Government believes in the importance of the Disarmament Commission as a deliberative, specialized body in the field of disarmament and an important means of ensuring international peace and security. In that regard, we would like to make the following points on various aspects of disarmament.

With regard to disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation, we should like to reaffirm that nuclear non-proliferation can be realized only if all States accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and place all their installations and programmes under the comprehensive safeguards agreement of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), with a view to determining that those programmes have peaceful purposes.

My Government also believes in its responsibility to respect and implement international non-proliferation and disarmament instruments and stresses our commitment thereto. As a reflection of that commitment, the Iraqi Constitution, in its article 9(E), stipulates that the Iraqi Government shall respect and implement all international instruments with regard to non-proliferation and the development, production and use of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons. The Constitution also prohibits the development, manufacture or use of such weapons, together with any technologies or equipment that can be used in their manufacture or delivery systems.

The national control entity in Iraq has also drafted a specific law aimed at establishing a unified national system in the context of our commitment to international non-proliferation and disarmament treaties that would cover the material and equipment used in the production, possession, storage, import or export of such weapons and ensure that none of these

devolve into proscribed activities, determine penalties, if necessary, and establish mechanisms for the submission of declarations on and licensing procedures for dual-use material, in accordance with NPT guarantees and the verification system for chemical and biological weapons.

It is worth noting that Iraq acceded to the NPT in 1969 and signed the Model Protocol Additional to the Agreements between States and the International Atomic Energy Agency for the Application of Safeguards on 9 October 2008, which is now before Parliament for its consideration and adoption. Iraq also voluntarily declared its commitment to apply the Protocol on 17 February 2010 and, in accordance with article 17 of the Protocol, submitted its first declaration in this regard on 16 July 2010. Iraq also ratified the Chemical Weapons Convention in February 2009 and signed the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty on 19 August 2008. It acceded to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction in 1991. It has also joined The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation, becoming the one hundred and thirty-first party thereto on 11 August 2010. Iraq also submitted its first declaration in this regard on 30 March 2011 and has acceded to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material. The country has also signed the Convention on Cluster Munitions and the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention and is currently in the process of establishing a comprehensive national strategy in those fields.

Great efforts have been made at the international level in the field of disarmament. However, the continued possession of nuclear arsenals by nuclear-weapon States and their development of new types of weapons and delivery systems is a great source of concern.

It is imperative that an agreement be reached on a legally binding international instrument providing guarantees to non-nuclear States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Measures aimed at making progress towards that objective should also be established. Negative security assurances are an essential step in that direction, in addition to being a legitimate demand of non-nuclear-weapon States, which have voluntarily given up any nuclear military option by acceding to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

In this regard, we would like to underscore the importance we attach to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice of 8 July 1996, which affirms that the use or the threat of use of nuclear weapons is in contravention of international law relating to armed conflicts and reasserts the commitment of States to seek to conduct negotiations on nuclear disarmament in good faith, under a strict international control system.

My delegation also stresses the importance of establishing zones free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction as an important step towards complete disarmament and in support of international peace and security. On the basis of this position, Iraq has contributed to efforts to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones in various geographic areas, in particular in the Middle East. We would like to reaffirm, in this regard, our support for Security Council resolutions 487 (1981) and 687 (1991). Any effort to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East must necessarily be preceded by a number of basic steps, including nuclear disarmament by Israel, its accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the submission of its nuclear facilities to the comprehensive safeguards regime of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

My delegation also reiterates the importance of implementing the decision of the 2010 NPT Review Conference calling for an international conference to be held in 2012 with a view to establishing a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction in the region. The 1995 resolution should be taken as the reference point for that effort.

My delegation would also like to take this opportunity to assert the importance of consultations among neighbouring countries regarding the establishment of nuclear reactors near border areas. Appropriate measures must be taken in this regard, under the supervision of the IAEA and other international and regional organizations concerned with the environment, in order to limit the negative effects on the environment in all regions and to guarantee that no leaks occur, which may harm people and the environment. Densely populated areas must also be taken into consideration and the protection of rivers and other waterways given great importance

when such decisions are taken. There must also be an absolute commitment to nuclear safety criteria and due account given to the fact that any radioactive leak may have catastrophic consequences on both humans and the environment.

The Chair took the Chair.

The work before us in the Disarmament Commission is of great importance and has a major impact on international disarmament efforts. Our Commission has made a great contribution to the development of international criteria for disarmament. My delegation stands ready to cooperate fully with all members of the Commission to make progress towards our common goal of disarmament.

Mr. Cox (United Kingdom): May I begin by joining other nations in congratulating you, Sir, and the other members of the Bureau on the assumption of your positions. I can assure you that you will find the United Kingdom a constructive partner in supporting your efforts.

The United Kingdom fully endorses the statement delivered by the Permanent Representative of Hungary on behalf of the European Union yesterday morning (see A/CN.10/PV.310). We would like to add some further comments in our national capacity.

The United Kingdom Government remains committed to the long-term objective of a world without nuclear weapons. We have a strong record on fulfilling our disarmament commitments and meeting our international and legal obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The United Kingdom is committed to maintaining only a minimum nuclear deterrent. We have signed and ratified the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and ceased production of fissile material for military purposes.

The successful conclusion of the 2010 NPT Review Conference, together with the welcome recent ratification of the New START agreement by the United States and Russia, has given us a critical boost for disarmament efforts in the year ahead. We will continue to seek to work with the international community to build upon the momentum that those developments have generated in order to make further progress.

The October 2010 Strategic Defence and Security Review reaffirmed our commitment to maintaining a minimum effective nuclear deterrent but also contained a number of new disarmament measures. We announced that the United Kingdom would reduce the number of warheads onboard each of our submarines from 48 to 40; reduce our requirement for operationally available warheads from fewer than 160 to no more than 120; reduce the number of operational missiles on the Vanguard class submarines to no more than eight; and reduce our overall nuclear-weapon stockpile to no more than 180 by the mid-2020s. We also announced a new, stronger security assurance that the United Kingdom would not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the NPT.

The announcements in the October 2010 Strategic Defence and Security Review complemented other commitments the United Kingdom has made on disarmament. In September 2009, we hosted a conference of the five permanent members of the Security Council (P-5) on confidence-building measures towards nuclear disarmament, and we look forward to further engaging with the P-5 at the 2011 conference in Paris to make progress against our commitments in the NPT action plan. We are continuing research with a non-nuclear weapon State, Norway, into the verification challenges of nuclear disarmament, taking forward our long-running collaboration. We firmly believe that increasing transparency and developing technical, military and political solutions to the practical challenges of disarmament are vital to making tangible progress towards our ultimate goal of a world without nuclear weapons.

We are disappointed, however, that, despite the momentum that has been generated by these positive developments, the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva remains deadlocked. In spite of the approval in 2009 of a programme of work (CD/1864) that mandated, by consensus, discussions on all agenda items and the start of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty, there has been no progress to that end. We have repeatedly expressed our willingness to engage on all four core Conference on Disarmament issues, which should all be discussed as part of any programme of work. We will continue to work with the international community to reach an agreement based on CD/1864.

The United Kingdom looks forward to working with the international community here in the

Disarmament Commission and in other international forums to control proliferation, make progress on multilateral disarmament, build trust and confidence between nuclear-weapon and non-nuclear-weapon States and take tangible steps towards a safer and more stable world, where countries with nuclear weapons ultimately feel able to relinquish them.

The spread of nuclear weapons poses a threat to the security of all States. Conversely, effective non-proliferation is a critical enabler for nuclear disarmament. Efforts to abolish nuclear weapons cannot succeed if we cannot stop them from spreading. It is therefore essential that all parties fully comply with the provisions of the NPT. Otherwise, the confidence necessary for parties to take measures to strengthen the Treaty will be further eroded, with dire consequences for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The United Kingdom continues to believe that the proliferation of weapons and materials of mass destruction to non-State actors remains a serious threat. International non-proliferation regimes and initiatives have an important role in combating this threat. The United Kingdom supports the full implementation of Security Council resolution 1540 (2004) and is working to achieve this goal through national programmes and international initiatives. The United Kingdom is active in a number of non-proliferation initiatives, including the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism, the Group of Eight Global Partnership and the Nuclear Security Summit process.

Universal adherence to the Additional Protocol is fundamental to the non-proliferation regime because it provides the necessary minimum assurances that nuclear technologies are being used peacefully. If we are to build on the successes of May 2010, we also need to work together on strengthening the Treaty, including with regard to non-compliance and ensuring that any benefits accrued as a member are not kept if a country chooses, as is its sovereign right, to withdraw.

The United Kingdom extends its deepest sympathy to Japan for the terrible events of the past few weeks. It is too early to say what the impact will be for peaceful-uses activities, but we are reassured by the International Atomic Energy Agency's announcement of a high-level conference on nuclear safety in June and remain committed to continuously improving nuclear safety standards.

The United Kingdom looks forward to supporting the Chair's efforts to encourage constructive engagement at this year's session of the Disarmament Commission across the agenda, including in the discussions in the Working Group III on practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons. The United Kingdom fully supports ongoing negotiations on an arms trade treaty and looks forward to further progress at the July Preparatory Committee and at the conference next year.

We look forward to the opportunity over the coming weeks to exchange views with other States on the best ways to build upon the successful 2010 NPT Review Conference and to make progress across the three pillars of the action plan that were agreed last May. This includes sharing concrete ideas on how best to take forward work towards a the successful holding in 2012 of a conference on a zone free of weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, something that the three depository States are committed to achieving.

Mr. Langeland (Norway): Let me echo other delegations in congratulating you, Sir, and the other members of the Bureau on your well-deserved elections.

Since the last session of the Disarmament Commission, there has been important progress in some areas of multilateral disarmament and non-proliferation. Norway welcomes the positive outcome of the 2010 Review Conference of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). It is important that we are able to follow-up on the action plan adopted as a major outcome of the Conference (NPT/CONF.2010/50(Vol. I)).

While New START is a bilateral Treaty, its entry into force is an important step in drawing down existing nuclear arsenals, with a view to achieving their total elimination.

Norway is encouraged by the way the Anti-Personnel Mine Ban Convention and the Convention on Cluster Munitions have established and consolidated global norms prohibiting weapons that cause unacceptable harm to civilians, norms which go beyond the membership of these two legally binding multilateral instruments. Indeed, it has been shown that, in the field of humanitarian disarmament, it is possible for those who are ambitious to set the agenda and achieve results in the field. This is clearly not the case for other areas of disarmament.

Norway is pleased at the initiative of the Secretary-General to move multilateral disarmament and arms control forward. The High-level Meeting of the General Assembly held in September last year reconfirmed the deep frustration of most Member States over the long-standing impasse that has paralysed the formal multilateral machinery, rendering it increasingly dysfunctional. The Conference on Disarmament is designated as a negotiating body, yet no negotiations have taken place for a decade and a half. The long-standing impasse in the Conference on Disarmament denies the international community the possibility of moving forward on pressing disarmament issues and of implementing the important steps set out by the recent NPT Review Conference.

Additionally, the entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, despite its broad support, seems not to be on the horizon. Time is also running out for the preparation of the Middle East conference called for in the decisions of the NPT Review Conference.

The Conference on Disarmament is struggling. The same can be said about the Disarmament Commission. The High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Sergio Duarte, noted in his statement yesterday that the Commission has not been able to reach consensus for more than a decade. My delegation agrees with High Representative Duarte that the fate of this year's report remains in the hands of Commission members, but it is clear that the working methods of the Commission also have an important impact on whether this body can provide added value.

It is obvious that the Commission has not delivered the results that were expected when the General Assembly adopted decision 52/492. While much can be said about Member States and their lack of political will, we need to examine whether the current structure of three-year cycles, two broad topics and, not least, the consensual reports allows us to make the best use of the Commission.

Let me assure you, Sir, that Norway intends to contribute to reaching consensus at this year's session of the Commission. But, frankly, we are not very optimistic about the prospects. Is it feasible for the Disarmament Commission to adopt language stronger than that agreed at the NPT Review Conference last year? Do we really believe that the Commission will make a breakthrough on conventional confidence-building measures, small arms or an arms trade treaty? If we do reach agreement on a report, I believe that it will be a rather modest one.

Norway has, on a number of occasions, and not least in the First Committee, advocated a profound assessment of the Commission. We believe this is necessary, even if at this session we were to succeed in achieving consensus on a report.

Given its role as a deliberative body, the Disarmament Commission should seek to stimulate discussions and build common understanding on clearly defined topics on global disarmament and non-proliferation. These topics could be set out by the First Committee.

As a deliberative body, the Disarmament Commission should not be hostage to an outdated consensus rule. Norway believes that the outcome of Disarmament Commission sessions could be a Chair's summary reflecting the discussions, identifying areas where there might be a convergence of views and where positions are still far apart. Such an outcome may facilitate the work of the General Assembly, the First Committee and, possibly, the individual treaty bodies.

Like the Conference on Disarmament, the Disarmament Commission is at a crossroads. If we continue with business as usual, the Commission will be further marginalized and lose its relevance. Hopefully, there will be time during this session to discuss the future role of the Disarmament Commission.

Mr. Onemola (Nigeria): The Nigerian delegation congratulates you, Sir, on your election as Chair of the 2011 session of the Disarmament Commission. We also congratulate the members of the Bureau and the Chairs of the Working Groups on their elections. We assure them of Nigeria's support and full participation in the deliberations.

The Nigerian delegation wishes to express its appreciation to Ambassador Jean-Francis Régis Zinsou of Benin, Chair of the 2010 session of the Disarmament Commission, and to the previous Chairs of the Working Groups for their hard work during the last session. We also commend the insightful overview of the issues contained in the opening statement of the High Representative for Disarmament Affairs, Ambassador Sergio Duarte.

Nigeria commiserates with the Government and people of Japan over the recent tragedies caused by the earthquake and tsunami. We commend and admire the resilience and determination of the people of Japan, and hope for a quick return to normalcy as the nation of Japan heals and recovers.

Nigeria aligns itself with the statement made by the Ambassador of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement and the statement delivered on behalf of the African Group. Having said this, we would like to highlight the following issues.

We acknowledge a number of positive global developments in the context of nuclear disarmament, but reiterate the need for unrelenting efforts to attain the noble objective of a world free of nuclear weapons and, indeed, of all weapons of mass destruction.

My delegation remains concerned that the continued existence of nuclear weapons constitutes a credible threat to international peace and security. We reiterate that nuclear disarmament should remain the highest priority of Member States, and we are convinced that multilateral consultations remain the best way to negotiate international instruments on disarmament and non-proliferation. We view this as a core principle endorsed by the General Assembly in its resolution 63/50.

My delegation urges both the nuclear-weapon and the non-nuclear-weapon States to completely fulfil their pledges and commitments under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and other internationally agreed instruments. We reiterate the need for all to redouble efforts to honour their obligations under article VI of the NPT with respect to the decisions to take credible steps towards disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation, in all their aspects, in a transparent, irreversible and internationally verifiable manner.

Nigeria views the NPT as fundamental to protecting global peace and security from the threat posed by the proliferation of nuclear weapons. While we call on nuclear-weapon States to implement in good faith all their obligations and commitments under the NPT, these obligations should also extend to States not party to the NPT possessing nuclear weapons.

Nigeria reiterates its position that the nuclear-weapon States should, in addition to implementing these obligations, honour agreed international instruments, desist from developing new types of nuclear weapons, and grant unconditional negative security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States as a matter of urgency, in conformity with the principles of the NPT and within a legally binding framework.

My delegation commends the various unilateral and bilateral efforts aimed at nuclear disarmament. We further welcome the signing on 8 April 2010 of the New START agreement between the United States and Russia, which is the latest effort by these countries to commit themselves to the further reduction and limitation of their strategic nuclear arsenals. We hope that, as a first step, the full implementation of the pact will ensure a drastic reduction in the number of deployed nuclear weapons.

We are equally concerned about the slow pace of progress in the activities of Working Group I on recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. We therefore urge States parties, most especially nuclear-weapon States, to engage constructively in order to break this impasse.

The goal of the disarmament process is general and complete disarmament, under strict and effective international control, to strengthen international peace and security. My delegation therefore urges Member States to sustain the significance and continued validity of the consensus outcome of the first special session on disarmament (resolution S-10/2). In addition to this, we would like to stress the importance of the Conference on Disarmament and underscore the need to proceed with negotiations in the Conference on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons within a given time frame.

We consider the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) to be a significant step towards the realization of a systematic process leading to nuclear disarmament. We therefore call for the early entry into force of the CTBT. We believe that a lot more needs to be done in the enforcement of this comprehensive ban on all forms of nuclear test explosions, and hereby call on nuclear-weapon States to abide by relevant moratoriums on nuclear test explosions before the entry into force of the CTBT. We also urge, as an important disarmament priority, the commencement of negotiations on a non-discriminatory and internationally verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile

material for nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosive devices.

The realization that the world still harbours over 20,000 nuclear weapons in its arsenals is a matter of great concern to me delegation. The continued existence of these weapons continues to encourage the doctrine that favours their possession and use despite the danger they pose to regional and international peace and security. We therefore acknowledge yet again the landmark entry into force of the Treaty of Pelindaba on 15 July 2009. We call on all nuclear-weapon States and other United Nations Member States that have not yet ratified the Treaty's Protocol to do so without further delay.

My delegation would like to reiterate Nigeria's support for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, in furtherance of the objectives of the resolution on the Middle East (NPT/CONF.1995/32 (Part I), annex) adopted at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the NPT. We call on all States in the region and nuclear-weapon States to support the urgent establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in that region.

Nigeria is concerned about the exponential rise in the costs and consequences of military expenditures, which have risen to a figure of $1.5 trillion. We therefore call for a new global arrangement that will mainstream disarmament and development issues and promote security through greater openness. We urge member States to highlight the direct relationship between disarmament and development, and to strive to reduce the diversion of global human and economic resources towards the manufacture and acquisition of armaments.

The developing world has paid a heavy price arising from the effects of the illicit acquisition, manufacture and circulation of conventional weapons. We acknowledge the urgent need for Member States to effectively regulate the trade in and global movement of arms. There is also an urgent need for Member States to engage in a wide range of conflict-prevention measures, including those related to illicit small arms and light weapons. To this end, my delegation supports the goals of the United Nations and its established bodies and agencies on issues such as transparency in armaments, ammunition marking and tracing, landmines, cluster munitions and regional disarmament programmes.

We welcome the contribution of Member States during the second session of the Preparatory Committee for the United Nations Conference on the Arms Trade Treaty on elements of an arms trade treaty. We call on Member States to redouble their efforts as we prepare for the third Preparatory Committee in July 2011.

Finally, Nigeria appeals for a sustained but meaningful dialogue as we begin the deliberations in the Working Groups. We also wish Member States fruitful discussions during this session of the Disarmament Commission. Nigeria will make a constructive contribution to the deliberations.

Mr. Pham Vinh Quang (Viet Nam): On behalf of the Vietnamese delegation, I would like to extend our warm congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the chairmanship of the Disarmament Commission at its 2011 substantive session. I am sure that, under your capable stewardship, the session will have a successful outcome. I also congratulate the other Bureau members on their elections.

Viet Nam would like to associate itself with the statement made by the representative of Indonesia on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM).

This year's substantive session of the Disarmament Commission convenes at a critical juncture, when the world is faced with a complex situation calling for a new impetus in addressing the urgent issues of nuclear danger, disarmament and non-proliferation. The year 2010 witnessed some important international conferences and commitments on disarmament and non-proliferation, such as the New START agreement between the United States and the Russian Federation; the Nuclear Security Summit, in Washington D.C.; and the 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). While we take note of these certain positive developments, Viet Nam believes that much remains to be done with a view to achieving a consensus and comprehensive solution to the core issues of disarmament and non-proliferation.

The international community should make more tangible efforts to attain the goal of nuclear disarmament. We are of the view that the long-standing deadlock preventing substantial progress in the field of

nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation can be broken by promoting multilateralism and emphasizing the central role of the United Nations in the process.

My delegation underscores the vital importance of the Disarmament Commission as the subsidiary body of the General Assembly tasked as the specialized, deliberative body within the United Nations multilateral disarmament machinery allowing for in-depth deliberations on specific disarmament issues. We reaffirm our continued support for the work of the Commission. We believe that, with reinvigorated political will, Member States will enable the Disarmament Commission to make more contributions at this substantive session to the shared goal of disarmament and arms control.

With regard to the first agenda item, my delegation reaffirms Viet Nam's full support for general and complete disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. To this end, we support all initiatives aimed at nuclear disarmament in a genuine, transparent, irreversible and internationally verifiable manner, and nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects. However, we note that substantive progress has yet to be made, notwithstanding the genuine efforts made by the Non-Aligned Movement during the 2010 substantive session of the Commission, especially in Working Group I on recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. We hope that at this session the Commission will be able to agree on more concrete and substantive recommendations to this effect. In this connection, my delegation fully supports the proposal submitted by NAM to Working Group I, and calls on the Working Group to give it proper consideration.

Viet Nam wishes to underline the importance of the Conference on Disarmament as the sole multilateral negotiating body on disarmament. We call on the Conference to agree on a balanced, comprehensive programme of work by, among other things, establishing an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament as soon as possible. We also deem it necessary to start negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on a phased programme for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified time frame. We support all steps aimed at prohibiting the development, production, acquisition, testing, stockpiling, transfer, use or threat of use, and providing for the destruction of all nuclear weapons.

In line with its full commitment to the goal of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, Viet Nam signed the ratification instrument of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty in 2006 and concluded the Additional Protocol to its Nuclear Safeguards Agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency in 2007.

Viet Nam underscores the crucial role of nuclear-weapon-free zones in achieving regional and international peace and security. We strongly support the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones in various regions of the world. At the regional level, as a member of the Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone, Viet Nam is working hard with other States members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations to ensure the South-East Asian region is free of nuclear weapons. We would like to take this opportunity to urge the nuclear-weapon States to accede to the South-East Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Protocol with a view to enhancing confidence-building measures between the nuclear-weapon States and the South-East Asian countries.

With regard to the agenda item "Elements of a draft declaration of the 2010s as the fourth disarmament decade", we believe that it is time for the international community to agree on such a declaration, thus highlighting the importance and priority that the issue of disarmament deserves. We note with regret that, despite its constructive and substantive discussions in 2010, Working Group II was unable to conclude its work at that session. We believe that delegations need to demonstrate the necessary political will and flexibility during the 2011 substantive session of the Disarmament Commission in order to reach a consensus on recommendations on the elements of such a draft declaration.

In conclusion, we call on Member States to work in an open-minded, flexible and forward-looking manner, consistent with the relevant guidelines adopted by the General Assembly, to achieve a tangible agreement at this substantive session. We are ready to work closely with you, Sir, the Bureau and all other delegations for a successful outcome of the session.

The Chair: We have heard the last speaker on my list. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all representatives for their kind words addressed to me and the other Bureau members, and to thank the Vice-Chairs who helped me chair these meetings.

We have just completed the general debate. I have detected a sense of urgency in many statements. Indeed, in the third year of the current cycle, the international community expects the Disarmament Commission to act as the main deliberative body in the area of disarmament and to produce results.

As members are aware, we are facing an unusual situation in that we must consider three substantive agenda items in the final year of the cycle. Members are also aware that the current situation is the product of a consensus decision we reached in 2009 in order to emerge from our deadlock over the substantive agenda items before the Commission.

We have established three Working Groups, two of which are still without a Chair. I would like to take this opportunity to appeal to the regional groups to expedite their consultations on the selection of the Chairs of Working Groups I and III.

In the meantime, we need to work very hard to complete the process started in Working Group II on elements of the draft declaration. I wish the Chair of that Group, Mr. Kayode Laro of Nigeria, all of the Commission's goodwill in bringing the work of the Group to a successful conclusion. The Group already has a draft document to work on. We need to see the bigger picture and focus on what unites us, rather than on what divides us. I again appeal to all delegations to concentrate on those elements that command consensus and try to forge common ground on the draft declaration so as to enable the General Assembly to proclaim the fourth disarmament decade.

Working Group III also has a document that was extensively debated during the previous cycle. As soon as we have a Chair for that Group, I hope that work will proceed quickly to produce a document that can command consensus.

Despite the absence of any written document in Working Group I, we can still try to achieve some results there as well. Again, we will not be starting from scratch, as Working Group I has already discussed in detail all relevant issues related to achieving nuclear disarmament and the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. All of those ideas should probably be put in writing.

Having made this short inventory of issues before the Working Groups, I would like to say a few words about the working methods of the Commission.

I do not think that we should invent anything here. I believe that the Disarmament Commission has sufficient procedural tools and methods at its disposal to improve the efficiency of its work. What we need at this stage is to demonstrate political will and effectively use the tools that are already in place.

In that regard, let me remind delegations that in 2006 the Commission adopted a set of recommendations that, if implemented, could greatly contribute to resolving the issues that we are facing today. Some of the recommendations were as follows:

> "Chairpersons and Vice-Chairpersons of the Commission and its subsidiary bodies should be elected at an organizational session of the Commission, if possible at least three months before the beginning of the substantive session. The regional groups should accordingly present their candidates as soon as possible to ensure that such elections take place within that time frame;
>
> "Member States are encouraged to adopt the draft agenda of the substantive session of the Commission as early as possible at the organizational meetings of the Commission;
>
> "Member States are encouraged to present their national working documents to the Commission as early as possible before the beginning of the substantive session to facilitate deliberation in the meetings ahead." (*A/61/42, para. 16*)

Of course, my remarks should not be regarded as a criticism of the Commission or its current methods of work, but rather as a friendly reminder of the tools that we already have in our possession, which should be used effectively.

So what should be the way out for us, at least in the last year of the cycle? I would like to take this opportunity to again appeal to all delegations to see the big picture in a spirit of cooperation and goodwill, and to overcome the issues that divide us. We should focus on those issues that unite all of us. Of course, as individual Member States, we should not compromise our security concerns. However, I believe that, with the greater goal of the common good in mind, we could make an effort to finish the current session on a positive note.

Organization of work

The Chairman: In the absence of Chairs for Working Groups I and III, let me propose that we give priority to Working Group II, which is chaired by our colleague from Nigeria. Group II will hold two meetings tomorrow. I do not think that we should revise our programme of work, contained in document A/CN.10/2011/CRP.1. In my opinion, we should revise it by way of daily announcements in the *Journal of the United Nations*, depending on the situation.

Are there any delegations wishing to take the floor on the issues that I have just raised?

Mr. Farghal (Egypt): Just to clarify, are we having two Working Group II meetings tomorrow, one in the morning and one in the afternoon?

The Chair: Yes, we will have only Group II, which will have two meetings tomorrow.

Mr. Farghal (Egypt): I do not know how the other members feel, but my delegation would prefer to have the Working Group II meetings in the morning, because we already have a Chair for that Group. The Chair could use the afternoon session to consult with the geographical groups. Who would chair Working Group I?

The Chair: Working Group I will be chaired by a representative from the Group of Western European and other States. Working Group III will be chaired by a representative from the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States.

Mr. Farghal (Egypt): With your indulgence, Sir, could the Chair use the afternoon session to consult with the other two Working Groups to determine the Chairs of each?

The Chair: I have to say that we were initially planning to have Groups I and II start tomorrow and Group III at a later stage, in accordance with requests made by some Member States. But now, since we have a Chair only for Group II, we will have to hold both meetings tomorrow. I have been informed that the Western European countries will probably have a Chair for Group I tomorrow. If we hear something tomorrow, we will so inform the Member States.

Mr. Laudi (Germany): As I am taking the floor for the first time, allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of your important duties.

I would like to support the proposal made by you, Sir. I think that it is very sensible and pragmatic. It is the way that we should proceed. I would like at least to reflect my delegation's position, which may not be shared by the whole room, but is, I hope, by some delegations. We should proceed by holding two sessions of Working Group II, which already has a facilitator. In that way, we will make the best use of our allotted time.

The Chair: I thank the representative of Germany for his kind words and for supporting my proposal.

Is there any more support for my proposal?

Mr. Kvarnström (Sweden): I would like to take the floor very briefly to support what the representative of Germany just said. I think that, in the spirit of what we and others mentioned in our statements with regard to getting down to work, it would be a shame not to take advantage of the time available to the Working Group for which we actually do have a Chair. I believe that the other consultations can be carried out simultaneously.

Mr. Arrocha (Mexico) (*spoke in Spanish*): I wish to take the floor briefly to support the Chair's proposal and to echo the statements made by my colleagues from Germany and Sweden.

Ms. Douti (Greece): As this is the first time that I take the floor, I would like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of your duties and to wish you every possible success. Of course, I also wish to assure you of my assistance to that end.

I would like to express my support for the positions taken by my German and Swedish colleagues on this issue.

Mr. Hallak (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): As this is the first time that I take the floor, Sir, I would like to congratulate you on your assumption of the Chair and to wish you every success. We have great confidence in your diplomatic skill.

My delegation would like to know, Sir, what mechanism you will use with respect to appointing Chairs. At the moment, geographic groups are still consulting. What will happen after that?

The Chair (*spoke in Arabic*): With regard to your question about geographic groups' consultations, Working Group I will be chaired by a representative

selected by the Group of Western European and other States. The Group of Latin American and Caribbean States is currently holding consultations. We hope that we will very soon have a nominee to chair Working Group III. As some Member States have supported my proposal, we will have a meeting of Working Group II under the chairmanship of Nigeria while the Chairs for the other two Working Groups are selected.

Ms. Stoeva (Bulgaria): I would like to echo the support that has been made for your proposal, Mr. Chair. I think it makes a lot of sense because, if we prioritize the work of Working Group II, we will have more time for consultations, and that will result in a better use of time in terms of the other Working Groups.

Mr. Cassidy (Indonesia): It seems that the statements are beginning to reflect a consensus position on this issue. If it is possible, Mr. Chair, I would propose a suspension of 15 to 30 minutes in order that the Non-Aligned Movement group can respond to your proposal. I make this request because several positions have been expressed and we need to reflect upon them. We know that Working Group II is the only one with a Chair, and we recognize the relevance of pushing forward with that Working Group.

However, let me remind all the delegations that Working Group I is just as important as Working Group II. We therefore need to take a decision that reflects the equality of the groups, not only with respect to time but also in terms of the issues themselves. It should not be the case that the issues to be dealt with by Working Group I or Working Group III are less important than those of Working Group II. That is the reason that I ask for a suspension, after which we can again talk about tomorrow's programme.

The Chair: The representative of Indonesia has proposed that we suspend the meeting for 15 to 30 minutes so that members of the Non-Aligned Movement can hold consultations about a Chair for Working Group I; as he said, it is as important as Working Group II.

Ms. Stoeva (Bulgaria): I apologize for taking the floor again. My understanding is that the Non-Aligned Movement has requested a suspension of 15 to 30 minutes to consult on the Chair's proposal to hold back-to-back meetings of Working Group II. As I understand it, the Chair of Working Group I must be from the Group of Western European and other States.

The Chair: My understanding was that the Non-Aligned Movement group wished to meet with a view to selecting a Chair for Working Group I. It has been pointed out to me, instead, that the group wishes to meet to discuss the proposal to hold two meetings of Working Group II tomorrow. I thank the representative of Bulgaria for that clarification.

If there is no objection, I shall take it that the Commission agrees to suspend the meeting for 15 to 30-minutes to allow the Non-Aligned Movement group to discuss that proposal.

It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 5.10 p.m. and resumed at 5.30 p.m.

The Chair: I now give the floor to the representative of Indonesia, who had asked for the suspension in order to hold consultations among members of the Non-Aligned Movement group.

Mr. Cassidy (Indonesia): I thank you, Mr. Chair, for allowing time for the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) group to hold consultations. I noted that other groups also held consultations, which is a good sign.

I would like to convey NAM's view regard to tomorrow's work programme. NAM would like to agree with the Chair's proposal of holding meetings of Working Group II in both the morning and afternoon of tomorrow. However, we would like to remind members that this should not be regarded as setting a precedent for our working methods for the following day.

In that context, NAM believes that, because the Disarmament Commission should always make the parallel nature and equality of the issues paramount in order to have a balanced outcome, there should be a meeting of Working Group I the day after tomorrow in order compensate for tomorrow's additional meeting of Working Group II.

I would also like to remind the other Groups of their responsibility to nominate Chairs for Working Groups I and III.

The Chair: NAM's proposal is to hold morning and afternoon meetings of Working Group II tomorrow, without setting a precedent for subsequent days, as the three Working Groups need to work in parallel. The NAM group has also urged that the other Groups select their Chairs so that we can hold a meeting of Working Group I the day after tomorrow.

Mr. Sanabria (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): In my national capacity, but having participated in a brief and entirely informal meeting of the Group of Western European and other States, I would like to thank the representative of Indonesia, who spoke on behalf of the Non-Aligned Movement group, for his very constructive approach, which is consistent with what we have been discussing on our side.

The proposal made prior to the suspension was a pragmatic proposal and an important suggestion for us to make the most of the time available. But we are also certainly aware of the fact that there is a vacancy in the Chair of Working Group I, which must be filled by a candidate. We are working to identify a candidate. While we cannot be absolutely certain, we hope that we will be in a position to nominate a candidate tomorrow, so that work can proceed normally thereafter in the two other Working Groups.

The Chair: Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Commission decides, without setting a precedent, to hold two meetings of Working Group II tomorrow.

It was so decided.

The Chair: I hope that we will be able to elect the Chair for Working Group I tomorrow, so that the Group can start its work the following day.

I now give the floor to the Secretary of the Commission.

Mr. Cherniavsky (Secretary of the Commission): Many delegations have approached the Secretariat to obtain the document that was circulated at the final meeting of Working Group II last year. Since we were not clear about what the schedule would be — which was in fact just decided upon moments ago — we will circulate that document to delegations via email this evening. Paper copies will also be available here in the room tomorrow.

The Chair: I give the floor to the representative of Egypt.

Mr. Aly (Egypt): On a procedural point, I presume that we will likely start Thursday's meeting in a plenary format in order to elect the Chair of Working Group I, thereafter moving on to work at the Working Group level.

The Chair: I agree with the representative of Egypt that we should begin our work Thursday with an organizational meeting to select the Chair of Working Group I, and then proceed with a meeting of Working Group I.

I would like to thank the Commission for the atmosphere of cooperation. I hope that it will continue so that we can move forward and achieve something in this important Commission. The whole world has its eyes on us to make progress. Hopefully, through this kind of cooperation, understanding, flexibility and compromise, we will be able to reach consensus to achieve results that we can announce to the world by the end of this session of the Commission.

The meeting rose at 5.40 p.m.